



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010

No. 86

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 9, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PASTOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Great are Your judgements, Lord our God. Beyond all description are the ways You lead Your people. Your mercy extends from one generation to the next.

In every age You have exalted Your people and made them glorious, as long as they were attentive to Your Word. You created a road through the sea and opened a path through the desolate land to lead Your people to the awareness of lasting freedom.

Be with this Congress and this government of the people and for Your people. In our day lead this Nation to a new and glorious day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs.

MALONEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MALONEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, John Adams once said, "Facts are stubborn things, and whatever may be our wishes . . . they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence."

Well, when it comes to the economy, the facts are on our side. It's a fact that Bush's economic policies created the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. It's a fact that Republicans produced a recession with nearly 800,000 job losses each month and almost doubled our national debt. It's a fact that 8 years of tax cuts for the rich and trickle-down economics only left the American people hosed.

And it's a fact that this Congress ended those flawed policies and enacted tax cuts for working-class families and small businesses across America. Democrats created nearly 200,000 jobs a month this year, cut over \$800 billion in taxes, and we're about to cut almost \$300 billion more.

Democrats are rebuilding consumer demand, creating new jobs, and getting our economy back on track. And that's a fact, no matter how stubborn the minority wants to be.

THE NEED TO PRODUCE A BUDGET

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentlewoman who just stood here, the fact remains the Democrats are not introducing a budget. One of the fundamental principle things that this Congress should do is introduce a budget. This Congress should be embarrassed that they haven't introduced a budget that we can debate and discuss. It's one of the things that's lacking in this so-called leadership here.

They may want to talk about Bush, but the reality is the Democrats have the House and Senate and the Presidency, and they owe it to the American people, they owe it to this institution to produce a budget so that we can debate and discuss it in the United States Congress. It's one of the fundamental things we should do.

This Congress should be embarrassed that it has yet to produce a budget.

HEALTH OF OIL SPILL CLEANUP WORKERS

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the BP oil spill has caused a great emergency along our gulf coast. I hope as the response to it continues, we never forget the lessons of the Ground Zero workers.

In the wake of 9/11, thousands of men and women labored tirelessly. Driven by a sense of urgent purpose, safety precautions were not taken and assurances were given that proved to be false. The health of far too many of those who worked on that toxic pile, they suffered long-term health consequences.

Now, in the gulf, men and women are once again being exposed to a toxic sea

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4249

of elements. After just 40-some days, there are already reports that workers have suffered from exposure to the oil. And this cleanup will go on for years.

The time to address the issue of the health of the cleanup workers is now, before they lose it.

DUBOIS BUSINESS COLLEGE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the DuBois Business College started teaching courses in DuBois, Pennsylvania, 125 years ago. They pride themselves on a small student-to-teacher ratio and a stellar success rate for students. From legal assistants to clinical medical assistants, the college has spent decades helping to move people into careers with a future and a good paycheck.

In 1996, the college opened branches in the nearby communities of Huntingdon and Oil City. Then, in 2001, a core group of eight veteran instructors and working administrators purchased the college and committed themselves to continuing the college tradition of excellence.

The college will be celebrating its anniversary throughout the year, but this weekend they'll hold an open house and tours of their newly remodeled facility and new student annex as a commemorative celebration.

In an area where there are no community colleges, DuBois Business College has filled a need over its history and continues to offer quality and affordable education in the fields of accounting, business management, medical, legal, information technology, graphic arts, computer applications, and even movie making.

It is my pleasure to congratulate this institution on its anniversary and to wish them continued success and growth.

AMERICA IS RECOVERING

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the research by USA Today shows that Americans are paying the lowest tax rates since the 1950s—not the 1990s, not 2001 or 2002, but since the 1950s. The Democrats' tax cuts for middle class and small businesses are helping this economy. The economy continues to move in the right direction and it is being sustained. Unemployment is going down in 90 percent of our metropolitan areas.

And the President is attacking the BP oil spill in the right way. But as I represent the gulf region where fishermen and oystermen are, as well as oil workers, we've got to ensure that we continue to save jobs. That means the industry has to reform itself. No permit should be issued unless there is a

defined recovery plan that is approved and vetted by experts that are independent of the government and the industry.

We are saving and creating jobs, but we are as concerned about safety and security. This is the right path. Democrats reduced taxes. The President is in charge. We're going to be able to see America recover.

REALITIES BEHIND HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the administration held a town hall by telephone with seniors across the country to promote a health care takeover bill that costs more by the minute. Seniors need more than a sales pitch. They need to know the facts about this bill.

Fifty percent who depend on Medicare Advantage could lose this coverage. The impact of the bill could be devastating. In Texas, 300 doctors have already stopped seeing seniors. Seniors' loved ones will be deeply impacted by the takeover bill with a \$2,100 hit. This is the amount the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has predicted that early retirees, the self-employed, small business workers, and millions of others who buy family coverage in the individual market will pay more for their health insurance.

Instead of spending time selling a broken product, lawmakers need to repeal it and offer seniors a patient-centered health care plan that lowers costs and expands access.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

PART D DOUGHNUT HOLE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there's great news for seniors, and I think that they'll be receiving it in the mail soon. The notorious doughnut hole is going to be closed. And starting this week, the part D doughnut hole where seniors have to pay for their drugs at an immense amount that hurts them will start to be filled because of the health care bill we passed in this House without a single Republican vote that made it law. The Democrats did it.

And \$250 one-time rebate checks will go out as early as this week to seniors who are in the doughnut hole. They will start to be mailed out tomorrow, June 10. Seniors who fall into that hole can expect a \$250 tax rebate check in their mailbox to help them cover those costs, part of the Democratic bill that reformed health care that didn't have a single Republican vote to help it become law. There were 217, 218 Democratic votes up to make that law.

Eventually, the doughnut hole will be eliminated, but we start with these \$250 checks. And I am proud to have voted for it, proud to have supported it, and pleased to give seniors relief from drug bills that are hurting them every day.

WHY WE HAVE NO BUDGET

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, here's one way the American people can tell that it's an election year. After racking up record deficits, congressional Democrats are now trying to run away from the truth about their out-of-control spending.

Last fiscal year, Democrats in Congress tallied a record \$1.4 trillion of deficit spending. Through the first 7 months of this year, they've already overspent by \$800 billion.

So it's no wonder, with elections coming up in just a few months, that they don't want you to know how much deficit spending they plan to do next year. That's why we have no budget.

House Democrats are not putting a budget on the table. They don't want to own up to their numbers. They don't want you to see another trillion dollars added to the deficit. So they'll just leave the books open without a plan and spend without restraint.

About the only thing that will stop them is if the American people speak up and say this is not acceptable. We sent you to Congress to lead; so write a budget.

GOVERNMENT MUST ENFORCE POLLUTION LAWS

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Sustainable Energy and Environment Caucus had a meeting with Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson, and she told us something that I thought was encouraging, which is that the United States Federal Government has insisted that British Petroleum drill a second relief well to make sure that we've got a relief well that can ultimately stop this horrific spill in the gulf coast.

And it's encouraging because the Federal Government has to be the ultimate decider to make sure this job gets done. BP only wanted to do one well, but the President and his administration insisted that they do two wells to make sure that we get one that works.

But there's a disturbing effort now going on in the U.S. Senate to deprive the EPA of the ability to clean up the industry that is now putting pollution in the air as well. We've got to preserve the Federal Government's ability to enforce our air pollution and clean water laws. The American people deserve that. We ought to stand strong to

have a sheriff in charge of this operation.

HIGH-DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, a recent report has shown that enrollment in high-deductible health plans associated with health savings accounts grew by 25 percent in 2009 to a total of 10 million Americans. These plans, which often provide the lowest-priced health insurance, are targeted in the newly enacted health care bill.

ObamaCare will increase taxes on HSAs from 10 percent to 20 percent and will prevent over-the-counter drugs from being reimbursed tax free from the health savings accounts. Millions of Americans rely on HSAs to cover deductibles, insurance copays, over-the-counter medications, and a plethora of other medical expenses. Furthermore, HSAs are an excellent tool to cut health care costs, while ObamaCare, itself, provides no such tools.

If you truly support health care affordability, I ask you to support my legislation, H.R. 5126, which restores the valuable tool that saves costs.

□ 1015

SARAH NOBLE SCHOOL WALKING PROJECT

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, more than 52,000 miles in 4 weeks. That is what 10,000 steps, or 5 miles, every single day is. That's what the kids at Sarah Noble School in New Milford, Connecticut, accomplished in May. In their fourth annual school walking project for fifth graders, students lived by the "Triple E" mantra: exercise, eating healthy, and protecting the environment. These students are putting themselves on a path to a healthier life by investing in walking. Healthy habits that can start now can pay off as they grow older because, as we know, obese youth are becoming an epidemic. They are more likely to have high-risk factors for cardiovascular disease such as high cholesterol and high blood pressure, as well as Type II diabetes and several types of cancer.

We've got to break this cycle, and it starts with a single step, some healthy snacks, and keeping the air we breathe clean. At Sarah Noble School, fifth graders are already doing their part, and they have given me this pedometer to help me do the same. Together, we can all strive to be healthy, one step at a time.

AMERICA SPEAKING OUT TOWN HALL

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to engage Floridians to talk about the challenges facing our country, I hosted an America Speaking Out town hall meeting in Plant City, Florida, late last week. City Hall was packed with people who are concerned about the direction our country is headed. Their message was loud and clear: Washington has ignored the voice of the American people and pushed through an agenda that does nothing but grow the size of government and our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, instead of handing an IOU to future generations in an effort to radically grow the government, Washington should exercise fiscal restraint and produce economic solutions that let people and businesses keep more of what they earn so they can innovate, grow, and create jobs to kick-start our economy.

Mr. Speaker, Washington can no longer ignore the voice of the people. Americans are speaking out and Washington needs to listen.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Last week, the unemployment rate dropped to 9.7 percent, and the economy added over 400,000 jobs. Since the beginning of last year, we have added an average of 200,000 jobs a month. Unemployment rates dropped in 90 percent of the Nation's largest metro areas, with much of the improvement seen in the manufacturing sector instead of outsourcing like it was done in the past administration. And thanks in large part to the first-time home buyers tax credit, home sales rose in April as well.

But while our economy is showing signs of progress, our work is far from over. We must continue to focus on solid, job-creating bills that will help our economy move forward. Yet even though progress has been made, Republicans want to continue to side with Wall Street and the big banks that caused the crisis. Saying "no" over and over again is not progress; it is destructive.

Democrats are committed to keep on working and focusing on initiatives that will correct the failed policies of the past, but we all must work together.

WHERE HAVE ALL THE INVESTIGATIVE REPORTERS GONE?

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, investigative journalists pursued alleged scandals involving former House majority leader Tom DeLay and former White House deputy chief of staff Karl

Rove, even though neither was ever convicted of any wrongdoing. But today, few investigative reporters are focused on what could be a criminal attempt by the Obama administration to manipulate the Democratic Senate primaries in Pennsylvania and Colorado.

While we don't know all the facts about the administration's actions, we do know the following: It is against the law to offer a government job in exchange for dropping out of a political race. It is against the law for administration officials to interfere in the nominee process of a Senate election. And it is against the law to obstruct justice.

Rather than a swarm of investigative reporters demanding answers from the administration, we hear only the sound of crickets chirping on the White House lawn.

JOBS

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and disheartened by congressional Republicans' attempts to reinstitute the same flawed policies that created the economic crisis we find ourselves in today. Congressional Republicans are determined to abandon Americans who have lost their jobs and partner with special interest groups like the Wall Street banks, credit card companies, Big Oil, and insurance companies.

Their intent is shown in their voting record. Republicans have voted against every major piece of economic legislation we've taken up this year. They voted "no" on the Recovery Act. They voted "no" to rein in banks through Wall Street reform. They even voted "no" for summer jobs.

I am proud to be a Democrat in this Congress and stand up for hard-working Americans. Our party is dedicated to moving America in a new direction, creating good American jobs, lowering taxes for the middle class and small businesses, and building a strong new foundation for the economy and for Main Street.

The growing signs of economic recovery show our policies are working. Consider that American jobs have been created in six of the last seven months, averaging nearly 200,000 jobs a month this year. While more needs to be done, Mr. Speaker, America is on the road to recovery.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. A recent Gallup poll showed 79 percent of Americans now view the Federal debt as a serious threat to the future well-being of this Nation. It's no wonder because the administration just announced that the Nation's debt will

reach 93 percent of GDP this year, a new high. Economic experts predict that unprecedented debt level could squash at least 1 million more jobs. The news came the same day the Labor Department reported that nearly all of the new jobs were temporary hires at the Census and some of them rehires at that.

Make no mistake, the out-of-control government spending, coupled with the heavy debt, prevent us from creating the quality jobs and the bright future America Americans want, need, and deserve.

It's time to get our fiscal house in order, once and for all. The stimulus, the bailouts, government-run health care: Enough is enough.

NO MORE BAILOUTS

(Mr. KAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I listened to families in Green Bay, Marinette, Niagara, Crandon, Wausaukee, Crivitz, Minocqua, Woodruff, Waupaca, Shawano, Greenville, and Appleton. Everywhere I went people were saying the same thing, and they're playing by the rules, playing and living by the rules. They're working hard and paying their bills on time. It's the Wisconsin way.

They've asked me to deliver this message to Washington: No more bailouts for Wall Street corporations; no bailouts of Big Oil companies who have determined our energy policy for decades. And to British petroleum, we say, You broke it, you fix it.

On May 19, I gave British Petroleum president Lamar McKay an opportunity to live up to his corporate word immediately, not 10 years from now, when I asked him to put \$25 billion into the United States Treasury to begin cleaning up the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history, but when asked to take responsibility, he took a pass.

People in Wisconsin believe in responsibility, both personal and corporate. People in Wisconsin want BP to pay up front, and that is why I'm introducing the Oil Spill Responsibility Act of 2010, requiring immediate payment of \$25 billion by BP.

ISRAEL HAS A RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been a strong supporter of the U.S.-Turkish alliance. I've been to Ankara, Turkey. I have met with officials there. I knew the President before he was President of Turkey.

So you can imagine my dismay, Mr. Speaker, with the recent aggressive action by Turkey toward our most cher-

ished ally, Israel. The complicity of Turkey in launching a flotilla to challenge the blockade in Gaza, the ensuing violence that occurred, the grievous loss of life is deeply troubling to those of us who have supported the U.S.-Turkish alliance in the past.

A few things need to be said. We grieve the loss of life, but Israel has a right to defend itself, and Turkey must know that America will stand with Israel in her inviolate right to defend herself. There is no humanitarian crisis in Gaza. Ten thousand tons of food and medical supplies are transferred into Gaza every single week, and the blockade has saved lives.

Hamas used the Gaza strip to launch vicious and brutal attacks, thousands of rockets on civilians. It costs lives in Gaza. It costs lives in Israel. Turkey needs to count the cost. Turkey needs to decide whether its present course is in its long-term interests, but America will stand with Israel.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF REV. LEMUEL YAZZIE

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of a true American hero. On May 28, we lost another of the last surviving Navajo code talkers: Reverend Lemuel Yazzie of Whitecone, Arizona.

Navajo code talkers saved the lives of countless Americans during World War II and the Korean War by using Dine to help the Marines communicate without risk of interception by the enemy. Reverend Yazzie served bravely and honorably as part of this legendary group.

After leaving the military, he kept giving back, serving for years as a missionary, staying involved with community work, and helping organize a committee to aid workers suffering from the effects of uranium exposure.

An active member of the Navajo Cold Talker Association, Reverend Yazzie was dedicated to recognizing all Dine fighting men and women have done for this country. We must follow his lead.

In his honor, I will continue my efforts to keep our promises to veterans in Navajo Country and across the Indian Nation.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2008, BONNEVILLE UNIT CLEAN HYDROPOWER FACILITATION ACT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 2008) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project, the Clerk be directed to carry out the modification that I have placed at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.

The authority under the provisions of section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-381; 42 U.S.C. 16421a) shall not be used to fund any study or construction of transmission facilities developed as a result of this Act.

Mr. INSLEE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

URGING U.S. ACTION AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 989) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt national policies and pursue international agreements to prevent ocean acidification, to study the impacts of ocean acidification, and to address the effects of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems and coastal economies.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 989

Whereas the world's oceans have absorbed more than a quarter of the carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere since the start of the Industrial Revolution;

Whereas the increased absorption of carbon dioxide by the world's oceans alters the form of nutrients and chemicals in the oceans and results in ocean acidification;

Whereas ocean acidification threatens carbonate-forming species such as coral, shellfish, and marine plankton, and may cause major ripple effects throughout marine ecosystems and food webs, ultimately affecting the largest marine organisms and many commercial fisheries;

Whereas ocean acidification will affect the growth, reproduction, disease resistance, and other biological and physiological processes of many marine organisms;

Whereas ocean acidification will be accelerated in Arctic waters because carbon dioxide is more soluble in colder waters and

lower salinity diminishes the capacity of oceans to buffer against acidification;

Whereas over 60 percent of the United States population lives in coastal States and could be affected by changes to marine ecosystems;

Whereas coastal communities depend on revenue from the fishing and tourism industries, which rely on the health and stability of marine ecosystems;

Whereas commercial and recreational fisheries contribute more than \$73,000,000,000 annually to the United States economy and support more than 2,000,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas coastal tourism and recreation produce \$70,000,000,000 in annual revenue in the United States;

Whereas coral ecosystems are a source of food for millions; protect coastlines from storms and erosion; provide habitat, spawning, and nursery grounds for economically important fish species; provide jobs and income to local economies from fishing, recreation, and tourism; are a source of new medicines; and are hotspots of marine biodiversity;

Whereas 500,000,000 people worldwide rely on reefs for food, income, and protection;

Whereas coral reefs support an estimated 25 percent of marine species globally and produce a net global economic benefit of about \$30,000,000,000 per year;

Whereas if current trends in global emissions of carbon dioxide continue, corals could be functionally extinct by the middle to the end of this century; and

Whereas the Congress has recognized the need to address the impacts of ocean acidification by enacting the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009 as part of Public Law 111-11: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt national policies and pursue international agreements to prevent ocean acidification, to study the impacts of ocean acidification, and to address the effects of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems and coastal economies.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution before us that deals with a problem of extraordinary dimensions having to do with the health of our oceans. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL, Chairwoman BORDALLO, Majority Leader HOYER, Subcommittee Chair BRIAN BAIRD and their help in getting a resolution to the floor to deal with this extraordinary threat.

We know how much Americans today are feeling heartsick about the damage

to our gulf and perhaps the Atlantic Ocean as a result of the oil spill we are now suffering.

But what our resolution attempts to do is to focus on another perhaps worse threat to the oceans today associated with the burning of fossil fuels, and that is the sad, unalterable, unambiguous, scientifically certain fact that our oceans are becoming more acidic, substantially more acidic, as a result of carbon-based pollution from our burning of oil and coal and other fossil fuels.

Because what we have learned in our research—and we have had a number of hearings on this—is the scientific community is telling us that, because of carbon dioxide pollution that comes from burning oil and coal, what happens is that the carbon dioxide that is coming out of our smokestacks and our tailpipes is going over the oceans and then is going into solution into the oceans of the world.

Fully over a quarter of all the carbon that we have burned, after digging it out of the ground and piping it up from below, has now found its way into the oceans. This is a scientific fact. All scientists, Republicans and Democrats, agree on this. As that carbon dioxide goes into the ocean, it creates acid, it creates acidic conditions. Today, the oceans are almost a third, 26 percent, more acidic than they were before we started to burn fossil fuels.

Now, the disturbing part of this is that acid, as you can imagine, does not seem a safe, benign condition in our oceans. The bad news is that the scientists have told us in our investigations that this acidification of the oceans is now increasing at dramatic rates. The oceans are 26 percent more acidic than they were before we started to burn coal and oil. But by the end of the century, by the end of my grandchild's lifetime, the oceans will be 100 percent, they will be twice as acidic as they have ever been during humans' time on Earth. And this is presenting extraordinary danger to humans because we have an attachment to the oceans.

And what we are being told by the scientific community is that the danger of these acidic conditions are that it makes it difficult, if not impossible, for huge swathes of the life in the ocean to survive. The reason is that large parts of the ocean community depend on taking calcium carbonate out of the water. They precipitate—that's a scientific term—they precipitate calcium carbonate into their shells.

Coral reefs take calcium carbonate to make coral reefs. Clams take calcium carbonate out to make shells. Perhaps most importantly, large amounts of the plankton that are the base of the food chain take calcium carbonate out to make the little structures of their bodies that make these little shell-like forms.

And as the water becomes more acidic—and this is what's disturbing and this resolution is intended to focus

America's attention on—as the waters become more acidic, these life forms actually dissolve in the acidic water of the oceans. We are now approaching the area, the level, where the acidic waters of the Pacific, Atlantic, Southern, Northern oceans will actually dissolve these life forms.

Let me tell you how dangerous this is. Dr. Jane Lubchenco, the director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, has come to us and actually shown us photographic evidence of shells, the little calcium carbonate sources of 40 percent of the base of the food chain. She showed us pictures of these little creatures actually dissolving in water that will be as acidic as it will be at the end of the century if we don't change things.

Now, there is no mystery about this. It's a scientific fact that the waters are becoming more acidic because of carbon dioxide, and it's a scientific fact that large parts of the Earth's oceans are dependent on this phenomena of taking calcium to form their life.

So what does that mean to us? Well, what it means to us in our grandchildren's lifetime is if we don't change what we are doing in an industrial basis, we will have significant reduction in mankind's use of the oceans, because fully 500 million people in the world depend on their protein from the oceans. Many Americans, including 2 million Americans, make their livelihood from the oceans that are going to be in jeopardy because of ocean acidification.

Seventy billion dollars a year of the U.S. economy is dependent on what is now jeopardized by the oil spill today in the gulf. But when you see those shrimp farmers and oystermen and fishermen whose livelihoods are at jeopardy in the gulf coast today, it is all the fishermen around the world whose livelihood is jeopardized by ocean acidification.

Let me note some of the scientific evidence about this. I will quote from Dr. Richard Feely of Texas Tech. Quote, "Already we've seen water showing up off the coast of northern California that's acidic enough to actually start dissolving seashells. It's thought that this kind of corrosive water showing up will become more and more common."

A quote from Nature magazine this year: "By mid-century, if we continue emitting carbon dioxide the way we have been, entire vast areas of both the Southern Ocean and the Arctic Ocean will be so corrosive that it will cause seashells to dissolve," close quote.

Quote from Nature: Quote, "In decades, rising ocean acidity may challenge life on a scale that has not occurred for tens of millions of years," close quote.

Perhaps the most disturbing quote I have heard is from Ken Caldeira, an oceanographer from Stanford, who basically has told me we're heading for something he likens as an ocean full of weeds because of the destruction of these multiple life forms.

And the one that's most telling to what we are seeing today in the gulf, a quote from Donald Waters, a commercial fisherman who fishes for red snapper and king mackerel out of Pensacola, Florida: Quote, "This is a devastating ghost lurking in the shadows that would change our whole lives," close quote.

So what we have today is a resolution by the House that we need to adopt policies and move forward in efforts to reduce this evil that is now lurking in the oceans of ocean acidification. We know what the culprit is; it is carbon dioxide. We know what the solution is, which is new clean energy technologies that we can embrace to try to reduce this pollution. And we know the ultimate outcome if we do not act, which is that our grandkids are not going to have an ocean as we know them.

And, personally, I can tell you it's already hit my State. Our oyster production now in the State of Washington has been severely dampened, probably because of ocean acidification that prevents the oyster larva from surviving. We don't know this for an absolute certainty yet, but this is the kind of thing that we are starting to see happen.

We are better than this. We know what the oceans mean to us, and we do not intend to leave behind an ocean without the Creator's creation of coral reefs and all the other creations of the ocean. So I commend this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 989 would urge the United States to adopt national policies and pursue international agreements to prevent ocean acidification to study the impacts of ocean acidification and to address the effects of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems and coastal economies.

As stated in the resolution, Congress passed the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act last year. This legislation authorized funding for research activities to better understand ocean acidification. This is to the tune of approximately \$76 million.

I would stress that, prior to adopting national policies and international agreements which could adversely impact American jobs, the administration needs to continue its efforts to conduct research to better understand ocean acidification to ensure that efforts to address its effects do not necessarily harm the United States economy. We have dedicated significant money for this over the course of time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I commend this to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman help me understand why this resolution is needed at this time. I don't want to try to debate—I appreciate your passion for this topic. It's evident and I appreciate that.

But given that we already passed the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act and authorized some \$76 million, why the need for this additional resolution?

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman will yield, it's a great question, and the answer is clear.

You look at Americans who today have it really deep in their hearts what's happening in the gulf. I know in your district, all of our folks, Republicans and Democrats, understand the damage that's being occasioned.

What Americans are not aware of yet is this other looming potential disaster in the oceans. We believe it's important for the U.S. Congress to go on record to say we, in fact, are going to deal with this, not just in a research component—and I appreciate the gentleman's pointing it out; we have passed a component to increase our research.

But research is not enough. We need action in the oceans. We need to reduce our carbon pollution in the oceans. And simply studying this problem is not enough. We can't study the problem for the next several decades and let the oceans die. So that's the reason for this resolution.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. And if the gentleman will respond to another question.

It talks in the very first sentence, "Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt national policies." By "national policies" does the gentleman mean the cap-and-trade?

What are national policies, in your mind?

Mr. INSLEE. Well, there are numerous policies that could deal with this problem, and our resolution does not specify any particular policy.

We look to the bipartisan efforts that we hope will succeed here in an effort that will reduce what causes ocean acidification, which is carbon pollution. There are many policies that can do that.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Would cap-and-trade be one of those?

Mr. INSLEE. A cap could be one of those, but there are many other policies that could be beneficial, many of which have already passed the House of Representatives, including our efforts to start building electric cars in America rather than China, building lithium ion batteries. We are opening up our first plant in Michigan where we are putting to work hundreds of out-of-work autoworkers.

All of these are great policies. We do not specify in this resolution any particular policy.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Reclaiming my time, I concur with the gentleman and the idea that we need to pursue green technologies. In my opinion, that includes nuclear technologies, getting the regulatory bodies out of the way so that we can pursue the adoption of nat-

ural gas vehicles and other types of things and technologies that would truly help our environment.

I would simply also, Mr. Speaker, suggest that when the characterizations of where the scientific community is on this—I do personally object to the quote "all scientists agree," end quote.

I don't think that is the case. From my purview and my perspective, I don't believe that, quote, "all scientists agree." I do think there is still debate in the scientific community, and I think that's a healthy thing along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address remarks in debate to the Chair and not in the second person.

Mr. INSLEE. May I inquire how much time we have remaining on our side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 11½ minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank the sponsor of this resolution. He has been a leader on this. And the fact is, they say that politicians think of the next election, statesmen think of the next generation.

This resolution is about the next generation. And the next generation and the generation after that need to have an Earth that they can inhabit that's similar to the Earth that was inhabited by our predecessors, because we are polluting it. And we need to be careful about what we are doing to the ocean. It's the last frontier, and we are polluting it greatly.

I want to bring up the work of a lady, no relation to me, whose name is Dianna Cohen. Dianna is in Barcelona, Spain, and she is doing an exhibition on plastics. She is the founder of a group called the Plastic Pollution Coalition.

The fact is, plastics break up and spread poisons and toxins that threaten our sea life, our marine life, get into our systems through our ingesting and eating those animals, and are a threat to our own present existence. When plastics are produced and they are put into the atmosphere and into the environment and end up in the ocean, they threaten us.

So what she has done in Barcelona, Spain, on the 8th of June, which is World Ocean Day, is have an Ocean of Plastic exhibit and taken plastics from the ocean and created art. It is teaching students there about the dangers of plastics, the threat to our ocean life and to our marine future.

I commend Dianna Cohen for her work. I commend Mr. INSLEE for his work, being a statesman and looking out for the next generation and for Mother Earth, which we have a duty to preserve.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns I have about this resolution is the vague nature of what these so-called national policies would be. Again, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would respond to a question.

Is H.R. 2454, the Waxman-Markey bill, one of the, quote, "national policies"?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, the national policies will be decided by this Congress rather than just myself or the gentleman. This will be a decision, the policies that we will make, hopefully, on a bipartisan basis.

The resolution does not pertain to any particular policy. There are probably a thousand good ideas here. We hope to find the best thousand and put them all to work.

□ 1045

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. INSLEE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to just make a couple of points. First off, I want to make clear that there really is no scientific debate or uncertainty about a couple of physical facts, and I just want to make this pretty clear. You can really search the world over, and you really will not find any scientist who will dispute the conclusion that when we put carbon dioxide into the air, much of it ends up in the ocean and dissolves and creates more acidic conditions. That's an established scientific fact. The second scientific established fact is now, because of some of the great work done in part by NOAA on behalf of the Federal Government, we are finding that the oceans are becoming more acidic.

I met the NOAA ships when they docked in Seattle about a year and a half ago when they came in. They did very specific studies where they dipped little containers in the water at various places in the water column. They bring it up and they do a pH experiment to determine its acidity. We did this as juniors and seniors in high school. This is very well established science. That is an established fact. There is really no debate in the scientific community about this.

Now, there is a question of how soon the coral reefs will disappear. Is it 40 years? Is it 60 years? Is it 100 years? There is still scientific research to be done on that, but we know at some point the acidity changes the ability of these life forms to exist in the water. That is very disturbing because vast amounts of the ocean is dependent on these creatures at the bottom of the food chain. At least 15 percent of food from around the world comes from fish that are dependent on coral reefs, and when they're gone, the fish are gone. When 40 percent of the plankton are gone, the salmon are gone that my people like to go out on a Saturday and catch. I can tell you with a scientific certainty that my people do not want

to risk the survival of salmon because we continue this pollution policy without dealing with it. That is a political certainty. So I think there is plenty of certainty.

Now, what policies we adopt on this, the gentleman knows there are many things to do. One of the policies that we have adopted on our energy bill would call for research to find out if there is a way we can sequester carbon dioxide from burning coal, for instance, so that if we can bury the carbon dioxide from the coal, we can continue the burning coal. That is part of our energy bill that we passed in the House of Representatives, just one of the policies of many we have.

One other comment I want to make. There is a lot of disagreement in the House about climate change and the science of climate change. We understand that. But I want to make people understand that this resolution has to do with a connected, but separate, phenomenon. If you don't think there is any climate change, if you believe that the melting of the Arctic in the tundra and Greenland is not associated with burning carbon dioxide, that's fine; but this issue we ought to have total bipartisan consensus on because there really is no disagreement about where the carbon dioxide goes. A substantial amount of it goes into the ocean and makes acidic conditions.

So I am hoping we have bipartisan consensus on this. This is related, but you don't have to be a believer in climate science to understand the clear acidification science. When you add carbon dioxide to the water, it makes it acidic. We learned this in high school. And now it's time for us to do something about it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, there have been some assertion that this is a worse threat than what's going on in the gulf. The most immediate threat to the oceans, at least that we see, is what's going on with the oil spill in the gulf. And it is nothing short of shocking that this President has yet to even call the leader of British Petroleum. Why he can't even make a call after nearly 50 days is truly absolutely shocking.

Again, I think we need to continue to have a debate and talk about the need to address the acidification in the oceans, but I do find that this House resolution is ambiguous when it talks about adopting national policies, which I think is a thinly veiled attempt to say that we should be adopting the cap-and-trade bill.

Further, I find that this bill is redundant in terms of the fact that Congress passed the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act last year, authorizing money to the tune of some \$76 million.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make the point and make sure Members know we are not advocating

any particular policy. What we are advocating here is that we, on a bipartisan basis, take the blinders off to a problem that we have to face on a bipartisan basis. You can't run or hide from ocean acidification. The oceans will have 150 percent increase in the acidity of the oceans if we don't find a bipartisan solution to this problem. We will have more CO₂ in the oceans than the last 650,000 years if we don't find some bipartisan solution to this problem.

So we just think the first step of any solution is recognizing the problem. We think we ought to recognize reality. We ought to take the blinders off, and we ought to take the first step of recognizing the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the gentleman who is presenting this bill and his clear passion for this. But, Mr. Speaker, when it says in the very first sentence that the United States should adopt national policies, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, this is clearly an attempt to try to say that we should be passing the cap-and-trade bill, which I am totally opposed to.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill; I don't think it's needed. We have made a commitment, on behalf of the United States of America, with the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act that was passed in an omnibus bill last year. The money has been set aside. The administration needs to do its work, and I would encourage them to do that. This is an issue that does need to be addressed. We don't try to dismiss that in any way, shape or form; but, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not needed at this time, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. INSLEE. To close, I would just like to comment. We're going to have lots of debates about the right policy to deal with this problem, but the country that put a man on the Moon should not be the country to blind itself to an obvious problem. And we are going to be swallowed by this and the oceans are going to be swallowed by this unless we first recognize the problem. It's a simple bipartisan step to say we've got a problem, we've got to work together to solve it. Let's do that. I commend this and move the motion.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, most of us know how the build-up of carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere is causing global temperatures to rise.

Less well known is how the build-up of atmospheric carbon dioxide is changing the chemistry of the oceans.

Because the oceans absorb atmospheric CO₂.

In a way, this is beneficial: reducing atmospheric carbon dioxide slows down the global warming effect.

But as the oceans absorb CO₂, the oceans themselves become increasingly acidic.

And the increasingly acid ocean waters can actually eat away the carbon shells of corals and a myriad of other sea life.

The people I represent live on islands surrounded by coral reefs.

Coral reefs protect us from storms and provide habitat for fish and shelled animals that are a traditional source of food.

The existence of coral reefs attract hundreds of thousands of tourists to the Northern Mariana Islands each year.

Economists have valued our coral reefs at up to \$70 million annually. Yet each year the oceans grow more acidic that economic value is being eroded.

I thank Mr. INSLEE for focusing on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 989 and national and international policies to prevent ocean acidification.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 989, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt national policies and pursue international agreements to prevent ocean acidification, to study the impacts of ocean acidification, and to address the effects of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems and coastal economies.

We know ocean acidification occurs as a consequence of high levels of man-made carbon dioxide emissions. But we do not know the full ramifications of ocean acidification. As H. Res. 989 suggests, the United States should pursue national and international activities and agreements to develop a full body of scientific research in addition to the work that will be done by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as part of the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009.

H. Res. 989 emphasizes that we must do more monitoring and research on ocean acidification in order to protect and preserve the ocean, which serves as a source of food, income and cultural identity for hundreds of millions people living in the United States and around the world.

As Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee for Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, I know firsthand how important it is for the U.S. Congress to act as a primary supporter of efforts aimed at curbing climate change and its consequences, including ocean acidification. And in representing a district whose livelihood and heritage were shaped by the South Pacific, preserving the ocean environment will always be one of my paramount concerns. I urge my colleagues to join with the 53 Members who have already cosponsored H. Res. 989 and support its passage.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 989.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further

proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GRID RELIABILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEFENSE ACT

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5026) to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system and electric infrastructure critical to the defense of the United States from cybersecurity and other threats and vulnerabilities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5026

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Grid Reliability and Infrastructure Defense Act" or the "GRID Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL POWER ACT.

(a) CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY.—Part II of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 215 the following new section:

"SEC. 215A. CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) BULK-POWER SYSTEM; ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION; REGIONAL ENTITY.—The terms 'bulk-power system', 'Electric Reliability Organization', and 'regional entity' have the meanings given such terms in paragraphs (1), (2), and (7) of section 215(a), respectively.

"(2) DEFENSE CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term 'defense critical electric infrastructure' means any infrastructure located in the United States (including the territories) used for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy that—

"(A) is not part of the bulk-power system; and

"(B) serves a facility designated by the President pursuant to subsection (d)(1), but is not owned or operated by the owner or operator of such facility.

"(3) DEFENSE CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE VULNERABILITY.—The term 'defense critical electric infrastructure vulnerability' means a weakness in defense critical electric infrastructure that, in the event of a malicious act using electronic communication or an electromagnetic pulse, would pose a substantial risk of disruption of those electronic devices or communications networks, including hardware, software, and data, that are essential to the reliability of defense critical electric infrastructure.

"(4) ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE.—The term 'electromagnetic pulse' means 1 or more pulses of electromagnetic energy emitted by a device capable of disabling, disrupting, or destroying electronic equipment by means of such a pulse.

"(5) GEOMAGNETIC STORM.—The term 'geomagnetic storm' means a temporary disturbance of the Earth's magnetic field resulting from solar activity.

"(6) GRID SECURITY THREAT.—The term 'grid security threat' means a substantial likelihood of—

"(A)(i) a malicious act using electronic communication or an electromagnetic pulse, or a geomagnetic storm event, that could disrupt the operation of those electronic de-

vices or communications networks, including hardware, software, and data, that are essential to the reliability of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure; and

"(ii) disruption of the operation of such devices or networks, with significant adverse effects on the reliability of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure, as a result of such act or event; or

"(B)(i) a direct physical attack on the bulk-power system or on defense critical electric infrastructure; and

"(ii) significant adverse effects on the reliability of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure as a result of such physical attack.

"(7) GRID SECURITY VULNERABILITY.—The term 'grid security vulnerability' means a weakness that, in the event of a malicious act using electronic communication or an electromagnetic pulse, would pose a substantial risk of disruption to the operation of those electronic devices or communications networks, including hardware, software, and data, that are essential to the reliability of the bulk-power system.

"(8) LARGE TRANSFORMER.—The term 'large transformer' means an electric transformer that is part of the bulk-power system.

"(9) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—The term 'protected information' means information, other than classified national security information, designated as protected information by the Commission under subsection (e)(2)—

"(A) that was developed or submitted in connection with the implementation of this section;

"(B) that specifically discusses grid security threats, grid security vulnerabilities, defense critical electric infrastructure vulnerabilities, or plans, procedures, or measures to address such threats or vulnerabilities; and

"(C) the unauthorized disclosure of which could be used in a malicious manner to impair the reliability of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure.

"(10) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Energy.

"(11) SECURITY.—The definition of 'security' in section 3(16) shall not apply to the provisions in this section.

"(b) EMERGENCY RESPONSE MEASURES.—

"(1) AUTHORITY TO ADDRESS GRID SECURITY THREATS.—Whenever the President issues and provides to the Commission (either directly or through the Secretary) a written directive or determination identifying an imminent grid security threat, the Commission may, with or without notice, hearing, or report, issue such orders for emergency measures as are necessary in its judgment to protect the reliability of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure against such threat. As soon as practicable but not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall, after notice and opportunity for comment, establish rules of procedure that ensure that such authority can be exercised expeditiously.

"(2) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—Whenever the President issues and provides to the Commission (either directly or through the Secretary) a written directive or determination under paragraph (1), the President (or the Secretary, as the case may be) shall promptly notify congressional committees of relevant jurisdiction, including the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, of the contents of, and justification for, such directive or determination.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—Before issuing an order for emergency measures under paragraph (1), the Commission shall, to the extent practicable in light of the nature of the grid security threat and the urgency of the need for such emergency measures, consult with appropriate governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico, entities described in paragraph (4), the Secretary, and other appropriate Federal agencies regarding implementation of such emergency measures.

“(4) APPLICATION.—An order for emergency measures under this subsection may apply to—

“(A) the Electric Reliability Organization;

“(B) a regional entity; or

“(C) any owner, user, or operator of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure within the United States.

“(5) DISCONTINUANCE.—The Commission shall issue an order discontinuing any emergency measures ordered under this subsection, effective not later than 30 days after the earliest of the following:

“(A) The date upon which the President issues and provides to the Commission (either directly or through the Secretary) a written directive or determination that the grid security threat identified under paragraph (1) no longer exists.

“(B) The date upon which the Commission issues a written determination that the emergency measures are no longer needed to address the grid security threat identified under paragraph (1), including by means of Commission approval of a reliability standard under section 215 that the Commission determines adequately addresses such threat.

“(C) The date that is 1 year after the issuance of an order under paragraph (1).

“(6) COST RECOVERY.—If the Commission determines that owners, operators, or users of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure have incurred substantial costs to comply with an order under this subsection and that such costs were prudently incurred and cannot reasonably be recovered through regulated rates or market prices for the electric energy or services sold by such owners, operators, or users, the Commission shall, after notice and an opportunity for comment, establish a mechanism that permits such owners, operators, or users to recover such costs.

“(c) MEASURES TO ADDRESS GRID SECURITY VULNERABILITIES.—

“(1) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—If the Commission, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, identifies a grid security vulnerability that the Commission determines has not adequately been addressed through a reliability standard developed and approved under section 215, the Commission shall, after notice and opportunity for comment and after consultation with the Secretary, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico, promulgate a rule or issue an order requiring implementation, by any owner, operator, or user of the bulk-power system in the United States, of measures to protect the bulk-power system against such vulnerability. Before promulgating a rule or issuing an order under this paragraph, the Commission shall, to the extent practicable in light of the urgency of the need for action to address the grid security vulnerability, request and consider recommendations from the Electric Reliability Organization regarding such rule or order. The Commission may establish an appropriate deadline for the submission of such recommendations.

“(2) CERTAIN EXISTING CYBERSECURITY VULNERABILITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section,

the Commission shall, after notice and opportunity for comment and after consultation with the Secretary, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico, promulgate a rule or issue an order requiring the implementation, by any owner, user, or operator of the bulk-power system in the United States, of such measures as are necessary to protect the bulk-power system against the vulnerabilities identified in the June 21, 2007, communication to certain ‘Electricity Sector Owners and Operators’ from the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, acting in its capacity as the Electricity Sector Information and Analysis Center.

“(3) RESCISSION.—The Commission shall approve a reliability standard developed under section 215 that addresses a grid security vulnerability that is the subject of a rule or order under paragraph (1) or (2), unless the Commission determines that such reliability standard does not adequately protect against such vulnerability or otherwise does not satisfy the requirements of section 215. Upon such approval, the Commission shall rescind the rule promulgated or order issued under paragraph (1) or (2) addressing such vulnerability, effective upon the effective date of the newly approved reliability standard.

“(4) GEOMAGNETIC STORMS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall, after notice and an opportunity for comment and after consultation with the Secretary and other appropriate Federal agencies, issue an order directing the Electric Reliability Organization to submit to the Commission for approval under section 215, not later than 1 year after the issuance of such order, reliability standards adequate to protect the bulk-power system from any reasonably foreseeable geomagnetic storm event. The Commission’s order shall specify the nature and magnitude of the reasonably foreseeable events against which such standards must protect. Such standards shall appropriately balance the risks to the bulk-power system associated with such events, including any regional variation in such risks, and the costs of mitigating such risks.

“(5) LARGE TRANSFORMER AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall, after notice and an opportunity for comment and after consultation with the Secretary and other appropriate Federal agencies, issue an order directing the Electric Reliability Organization to submit to the Commission for approval under section 215, not later than 1 year after the issuance of such order, reliability standards addressing availability of large transformers. Such standards shall require entities that own or operate large transformers to ensure, individually or jointly, adequate availability of large transformers to promptly restore the reliable operation of the bulk-power system in the event that any such transformer is destroyed or disabled as a result of a reasonably foreseeable physical or other attack or geomagnetic storm event. The Commission’s order shall specify the nature and magnitude of the reasonably foreseeable attacks or events that shall provide the basis for such standards. Such standards shall—

“(A) provide entities subject to the standards with the option of meeting such standards individually or jointly; and

“(B) appropriately balance the risks associated with a reasonably foreseeable attack or event, including any regional variation in such risks, and the costs of ensuring adequate availability of spare transformers.

“(d) CRITICAL DEFENSE FACILITIES.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall designate, in a written directive or determination provided to the Commission, facilities located in the United States (including the territories) that are—

“(A) critical to the defense of the United States; and

“(B) vulnerable to a disruption of the supply of electric energy provided to such facility by an external provider.

The number of facilities designated by such directive or determination shall not exceed 100. The President may periodically revise the list of designated facilities through a subsequent written directive or determination provided to the Commission, provided that the total number of designated facilities at any time shall not exceed 100.

“(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—If the Commission identifies a defense critical electric infrastructure vulnerability that the Commission, in consultation with owners and operators of any facility or facilities designated by the President pursuant to paragraph (1), determines has not adequately been addressed through measures undertaken by owners or operators of defense critical electric infrastructure, the Commission shall, after notice and an opportunity for comment and after consultation with the Secretary and other appropriate Federal agencies, promulgate a rule or issue an order requiring implementation, by any owner or operator of defense critical electric infrastructure, of measures to protect the defense critical electric infrastructure against such vulnerability. The Commission shall exempt from any such rule or order any specific defense critical electric infrastructure that the Commission determines already has been adequately protected against the identified vulnerability. The Commission shall make any such determination in consultation with the owner or operator of the facility designated by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) that relies upon such defense critical electric infrastructure.

“(3) COST RECOVERY.—An owner or operator of defense critical electric infrastructure shall be required to take measures under paragraph (2) only to the extent that the owners or operators of a facility or facilities designated by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) that rely upon such infrastructure agree to bear the full incremental costs of compliance with a rule promulgated or order issued under paragraph (2).

“(e) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) PROHIBITION OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PROTECTED INFORMATION.—Protected information—

“(A) shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code; and

“(B) shall not be made available pursuant to any State, local, or tribal law requiring disclosure of information or records.

“(2) INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the Controlled Unclassified Information framework established by the President, the Commission shall promulgate such regulations and issue such orders as necessary to designate protected information and to prohibit the unauthorized disclosure of such protected information.

“(B) SHARING OF PROTECTED INFORMATION.—The regulations promulgated and orders issued pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide standards for and facilitate the appropriate sharing of protected information with, between, and by Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities, the Electric Reliability Organization, regional entities, and owners, operators, and users of the bulk-

power system in the United States and of defense critical electric infrastructure. In promulgating such regulations and issuing such orders, the Commission shall take account of the role of State commissions in reviewing the prudence and cost of investments within their respective jurisdictions. The Commission shall consult with appropriate Canadian and Mexican authorities to develop protocols for the sharing of protected information with, between, and by appropriate Canadian and Mexican authorities and owners, operators, and users of the bulk-power system outside the United States.

“(3) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—Nothing in this section shall permit or authorize the withholding of information from Congress, any committee or subcommittee thereof, or the Comptroller General.

“(4) DISCLOSURE OF NON-PROTECTED INFORMATION.—In implementing this section, the Commission shall protect from disclosure only the minimum amount of information necessary to protect the reliability of the bulk-power system and of defense critical electric infrastructure. The Commission shall segregate protected information within documents and electronic communications, wherever feasible, to facilitate disclosure of information that is not designated as protected information.

“(5) DURATION OF DESIGNATION.—Information may not be designated as protected information for longer than 5 years, unless specifically redesignated by the Commission.

“(6) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—The Commission may remove the designation of protected information, in whole or in part, from a document or electronic communication if the unauthorized disclosure of such information could no longer be used to impair the reliability of the bulk-power system or of defense critical electric infrastructure.

“(7) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DESIGNATIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (f) of this section or section 313, a person or entity may seek judicial review of a determination by the Commission concerning the designation of protected information under this subsection exclusively in the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in the District of Columbia. In such a case the court shall determine the matter de novo, and may examine the contents of documents or electronic communications designated as protected information in camera to determine whether such documents or any part thereof were improperly designated as protected information. The burden is on the Commission to sustain its designation.

“(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The Commission shall act expeditiously to resolve all applications for rehearing of orders issued pursuant to this section that are filed under section 313(a). Any party seeking judicial review pursuant to section 313 of an order issued under this section may obtain such review only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

“(g) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRY IN MEETING GRID SECURITY PROTECTION NEEDS.—

“(1) EXPERTISE AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary shall establish a program, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop technical expertise in the protection of systems for the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy against geomagnetic storms or malicious acts using electronic communications or electromagnetic pulse that would pose a substantial risk of disruption to the operation of those electronic devices or communications networks, including hardware, software, and data, that are essential to the

reliability of such systems. Such program shall include the identification and development of appropriate technical and electronic resources, including hardware, software, and system equipment.

“(2) SHARING EXPERTISE.—As appropriate, the Secretary shall offer to share technical expertise developed under the program under paragraph (1), through consultation and assistance, with owners, operators, or users of systems for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy located in the United States and with State commissions. In offering such support, the Secretary shall assign higher priority to systems serving facilities designated by the President pursuant to subsection (d)(1) and other critical infrastructure facilities, which the Secretary shall identify in consultation with the Commission and other appropriate Federal agencies.

“(3) SECURITY CLEARANCES AND COMMUNICATION.—The Secretary shall facilitate and, to the extent practicable, expedite the acquisition of adequate security clearances by key personnel of any entity subject to the requirements of this section to enable optimum communication with Federal agencies regarding grid security threats, grid security vulnerabilities, and defense critical electric infrastructure vulnerabilities. The Secretary, the Commission, and other appropriate Federal agencies shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with their obligations to protect classified and protected information, share timely actionable information regarding grid security threats, grid security vulnerabilities, and defense critical electric infrastructure vulnerabilities with appropriate key personnel of owners, operators, and users of the bulk-power system and of defense critical electric infrastructure.

“(h) CERTAIN FEDERAL ENTITIES.—For the 11-year period commencing on the date of enactment of this section, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration shall be exempt from any requirement under subsection (b) or (c) (except for any requirement addressing a malicious act using electronic communication).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) JURISDICTION.—Section 201(b)(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824(b)(2)) is amended by inserting “215A,” after “215,” each place it appears.

(2) PUBLIC UTILITY.—Section 201(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824(e)) is amended by inserting “215A,” after “215.”

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, America's electric grid is vulnerable to cyber or other attacks by terrorists or hostile countries. Our adversaries are actively probing these weaknesses and already have the capacity to exploit them. The consequences of such an attack could be devastating. The commercially operated grid provides 99 percent of the power used by our defense facilities. Every one of our Nation's critical civilian systems—water, communications, health care, transportation, law enforcement, and financial services—depends on that grid. Classified Member briefings have underscored the urgency of this threat.

The GRID Act, which has been produced out of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, working with Mr. UPTON, the ranking member of the subcommittee, passed by a unanimous 47-0 vote. It is the product of months of bipartisan work led by Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Members Barton and Upton. It reflects important work by Mr. BARROW and other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee and by Chairman THOMPSON, Representative CLARKE—Chairwoman Clarke—and others on the Homeland Security Committee. And it shows that when it comes to the nexus between national security and energy, all Americans agree that we must chart a more secure path.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the members on our committee, both Republican and Democrat, not only in our subcommittee that Mr. MARKEY chairs and I'm the ranking member, but also Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Member BARTON.

This has been a multiyear effort; it really has. This bill is a product of that work. We've had a number of classified hearings and discussions and briefings over the last couple of years with Members attending for hours at a time. We've had some public hearings as well; and this bill is a product of that, which is exactly why the bill passed out of full committee 47-0 on a roll call vote.

The security of our Nation's energy infrastructure from attack is one of the most important issues that this Congress might address this year, and it's not an issue that we can take lightly. Energy, as we know, electricity literally powers our economy in everything that we do. Even small price spikes and supply disruptions can wreak havoc on our economy for perhaps who knows how long, and it is imperative that the security of our Nation's energy infrastructure gets all of the attention that it deserves. This legislation is a step in the right direction

to protect our critical energy and defense infrastructure.

Let me tell you a couple of things that this bill does. As it relates to cyber- and electromagnetic weapons, it gives FERC the authority to establish standards to protect the bulk power system against vulnerabilities to malicious acts using electronic communications or electromagnetic weapons.

Geomagnetic storms: The bill requires FERC to direct NERC to submit for approval a reliability standard under section 215 to protect the bulk power infrastructure. And for large transformers, the bill requires FERC again to direct NERC to submit for approval a reliability standard under section 215 to require adequate availability of large transformers to ensure the reliability of the bulk power infrastructure in the event of a physical or other attack with a geomagnetic storm.

□ 1100

I would like to cite just a few words in a letter that was signed by some real national security experts—James Woolsey, Stephen Hadley, John Hamre, Rudy de Leon, James Schlesinger, William Perry, and Willy Schneider, Jr. It's an official-use only letter, so I cannot submit this letter for the RECORD or read more than just a few words.

They say together: We strongly endorse the timely passage of this legislation in recognition that the electricity grid is a critical national security asset, the backbone of defense capability in modern civilization and also in recognition that the grid is vulnerable.

The letter goes on: We don't want a vulnerable grid. We, as a society, cannot live with a vulnerable grid. This bill corrects many of the flaws in what could otherwise be standard operating procedure.

Again, I applaud and thank Chairmen WAXMAN and MARKEY, Ranking Member BARTON, and all of the members of our committee who have spent many hours to address this situation with this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from the State of California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Grid Reliability and Infrastructure Defense Act.

When it is signed by the President, this will be a bipartisan law, and it will be vital in protecting the Nation's electric grid from cyberattacks, from direct physical attacks, from electromagnetic pulses, and from solar storms.

Beginning in the last Congress, on a bipartisan basis, a group of Members worked on this legislation—ED MARKEY, JOE BARTON, FRED UPTON, and I. JOHN DINGELL and RICK BOUCHER have also played significant roles in devel-

oping the proposal. JOHN BARROW had a very important part in this legislation as well. I commend all of them for working together with me in preparing for this legislation that we are presenting to our colleagues today.

The staffs of both the majority and minority had extensive discussions with interested stakeholders and agencies. We worked with many Members to answer their questions, to address their concerns, and to consider their constructive suggestions. Their input has strengthened this bill. It has been a cooperative process that has produced strong bipartisan legislation. In fact, the Energy and Commerce Committee favorably reported the bill by a unanimous vote of 47-0.

Today, our electric grid simply isn't adequately protected from a range of potential threats in an emergency situation. Where the grid faces an imminent threat, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission currently lacks the authority to require the necessary protective measures. There is also an ever-growing number of grid security vulnerabilities. These are weaknesses in the grid that could be exploited by criminals, by terrorists, or by other countries to damage our electric grid. There are weaknesses that even make the grid vulnerable to naturally occurring geomagnetic storms.

This bipartisan legislation will provide the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with the authorities it needs to address these threats. It also directs the Commission to look at the long-term threats, not just at the imminent threats, with standards written or approved by the Commission. In addition, the bill includes provisions that focus specifically on the portions of the grid that serve facilities critical to the defense of the United States.

These are important national security and grid reliability issues. We have heard from the Defense Department, from former Defense Secretaries, from national security advisers, and from CIA Directors. They have told us that the changes made by this bill are critical to our national security, and the Congressional Budget Office confirms that the final bill is budget neutral.

Today's legislation is an opportunity for all of us to work together, and I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity and to support this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that we have one other Member who wishes to speak, but I do not see him on the floor; so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW), to whom Chairman WAXMAN has already made reference. Mr. BARROW is probably the longest-standing Member who has been working on this issue.

Mr. BARROW. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his work on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, the grid that generates and distributes electricity across our

country is one of the engineering wonders of the world, but it took generations to build, and it grew up in peacetime, safely removed from any threat of physical attack by our enemies, and it was long before the Internet. Today, we use the Internet to run this vast infrastructure, and that leaves us vulnerable to a potentially devastating cyberattack.

The GRID Act takes the first steps toward protecting our electric grid from those who want to do us harm. The necessary costs are modest compared to the cost of doing nothing. We cannot count on our enemies to wait for us. The threat is real, and the solution is in our hands, so I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. UPTON. In seeing that the Member is not here, I would ask again for a strong "yea" vote, and I would hope that our Senate colleagues are listening so that they will be able to move this legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who, in the last Congress, was the chair of what is now the Emerging Threats Subcommittee on the Homeland Security Committee. I have worked with him under his leadership on these issues for years.

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5026, legislation to protect our national electric grid system. I would particularly like to thank Chairman MARKEY for his outstanding leadership and dedication to this important national security issue. I know he has given great time and effort and thought to this, and I thank him for that.

I would also like to thank Chairman WAXMAN for his attention to this issue.

I would also like to recognize and to thank my good friend Mr. THOMPSON, chairman of the full Homeland Security Committee, for working with me in 2008 to hold hearings and to closely examine what actions our country must absolutely take to prevent attacks on our national security electric grid.

Two years ago, I testified before Chairman MARKEY's subcommittee about the threats to our bulk power system from cyberattack. In the 110th Congress, as chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology, I conducted a detailed and thorough examination of cyberthreats to our critical infrastructure, and I want to reiterate what I made clear in my testimony.

I believe that America is still vulnerable to a cyberattack against the electric grid, which would cause severe damage, not only to our critical infrastructure, but also to our economy and

to the welfare of our citizens. The vast majority of our critical assets is in private hands. In many sectors, private entities are largely self-regulated and are responsible for developing and for implementing their own standards according to their own priorities.

This bill will ensure that serious threats to our electric grid are addressed by giving the Federal Government the ability to require strong safety measures in our electric power system. It has the foresight to not only specifically focus on cyberthreats but also to focus on other potentially devastating issues, such as electromagnetic interference. These measures will help to ensure that we prepare for the worst case scenarios and that we protect our citizens in the case of a devastating attack or accident.

So, again, I really want to thank Chairman MARKEY for his attention to this important issue, and I look forward to working with the Energy and Commerce Committee in continuing to raise awareness about securing our critical infrastructure and in protecting our citizens from cyberattack.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5026, legislation to protect our national electric grid system. I would like to thank Chairman MARKEY for his leadership on this important national security issue. I would also like to recognize my good friend and Chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. THOMPSON, for working with me in 2008 to hold hearings and closely examine what actions our country must take to prevent attacks on our national grid.

Two years ago, on September 11, 2008, I testified before Chairman MARKEY's Subcommittee about the threats to our bulk power system from cyber attack. In the 110th Congress, as Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, Science and Technology, I conducted a detailed and thorough examination of cyber threats to our critical infrastructure, and I want to reiterate what I made clear in my testimony. I believe America remains vulnerable to a cyber attack against the electric grid that would cause severe damage to not only our critical infrastructure, but also our economy and the welfare of our citizens.

The vast majority of our critical assets are in private hands. In many sectors, private entities are largely self-regulated and are responsible for developing and implementing their own standards according to their own priorities. This bill will ensure that serious threats to our grid are addressed by giving relevant government agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, the ability to require strong safety measures in our electric power system. The bill also has the foresight to not only specifically focus on cyber threats but also on other potentially devastating issues such as electromagnetic interference. The scope of the bill includes the bulk power system, which should also protect critical distribution systems in major cities, like New York and Washington, DC from a cyber attack. Additionally, by empowering the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, this legislation goes a long way to enabling a faster response by both government and industry in case of an imminent threat. These measures will help en-

sure that we prepare for worst-case scenarios and protect our citizens in the case of a devastating attack or catastrophe.

I applaud the attention being focused on this issue by the Congress, and I want to once again thank Chairman MARKEY for his attention to this important issue. I look forward to working with the Energy and Commerce Committee and to securing our critical infrastructure and protecting our citizens from cyber attack.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), who is in support of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan bill, H.R. 5026, which has been approved unanimously by a vote of 47-0 by the Energy and Commerce Committee. That doesn't happen very often in today's Congress.

According to the National Academy of Sciences, this bill is necessary because there is one event that we will not avoid, and that is solar geomagnetic interference—a solar storm. If—really, when—we have a big one like the Carrington event that occurred in 1859, this will shut down our whole grid. It would cost us only about \$100 million to protect the grid from EMP. This investment won't be made without H.R. 5026. The consequences of inaction are dire. If our grid is destroyed by EMP or by a Carrington event, which is an electromagnetic storm, the National Academies warn it will cost us between \$1 trillion and \$2 trillion in damages, and it will take 4 to 10 years to recover.

With the grid's being down, more or less, for 4 to 10 years, one can only imagine the consequences to our society. This is a really important bipartisan bill, and I rise in very strong support.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The GRID Act has three basic components.

First, it establishes Federal authority to address emergency situations. If the President identifies an imminent threat to the bulk power system or to other parts of the grid that serve critical defense facilities, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission can issue an emergency order requiring measures to protect against this threat. This authority covers threats from cyberattacks, from electromagnetic weapons, from direct physical attacks, or from solar storms.

However, in many cases, we will not know about a cyberattack or other threat to the grid until it's too late. Accordingly, the GRID Act establishes measures to protect the grid against key vulnerabilities so that, if and when

an emergency does happen, we are already prepared.

Most importantly, if FERC identifies a vulnerability to a cyber or to an electromagnetic attack that has not adequately been addressed, it has the authority to require intrameasures to protect the bulk power system.

The legislation also requires FERC, within 6 months of enactment, to establish measures to protect against the Aurora vulnerability to cyberattack. That vulnerability was identified nearly 3 years ago, but the current standard-setting process has not addressed it. That is unacceptable. It must be fixed.

Ranking Member UPTON and other members of our committee sat through a top secret briefing last October with regard to the threat that this Aurora vulnerability and that other vulnerabilities pose as potential threats to our country and which could be exploited by other countries or by subnational groups or by domestic terrorists. This is something that we must close. I think every Member in that top secret briefing left, having experienced a sobering moment in their lives, realizing the great responsibility we have to pass legislation that can deal with this problem.

The GRID Act also deals with other critical vulnerabilities. Solar flares cause geomagnetic currents that can destroy large electric transformers. Experts agree that it is only a matter of time before we experience a solar storm large enough to bring down a large portion of the grid, potentially causing trillions of dollars in damage. In addition, the grid is highly vulnerable to attack because the large transformers upon which it relies are built overseas and can take years to replace. The GRID Act addresses these issues by requiring the development of reliability standards to protect against geomagnetic storms and to ensure the availability of adequate backup supplies of large transformers.

Finally, the GRID Act gives FERC the authority to protect portions of the grid that serve the top 100 critical defense facilities against a cyber or an electromagnetic weapons attack.

The amended version of the bill now before the House makes one change to the version reported out of committee. In order to make the bill deficit neutral, the amended bill exempts the Bonneville Power Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority from requirements other than cyberprotections during the first 11 years after enactment. With this change, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that the bill will not affect direct Federal spending. The amended bill does not score.

Colleagues, the electric grid's vulnerability to cyber and to other attacks is one of the single greatest threats to our national security. This bipartisan legislation is critical to empowering the Federal Government and the private sector with the capacities they

will need to protect us against that threat.

□ 1115

There are people plotting right now that, if they could, would exploit this vulnerability.

I urge all Members to vote “yes” on the GRID Act. It is a moment that we must all come together in order to protect our country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), in support of the bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment Chairman MARKEY for referring to Mr. UPTON as “Chairman UPTON.” That may be a foreteller of things to come, and we appreciate his prescience in acknowledging that possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of H.R. 5026, the Grid Reliability and Infrastructure Defense Act, better known as the GRID Act.

This is an example of legislation that has come to the floor after a 47-0 bipartisan vote in the Energy and Commerce Committee that shows what the Congress can do when Republicans are allowed into the room to help draft and put into place legislation. While it is a rare occasion in this Congress, it certainly is something that both sides of the aisle can be proud of.

I want to especially commend Subcommittee Chairman MARKEY, Full Committee Chairman WAXMAN, Ranking Member UPTON, and others on both sides of the aisle to make this day possible.

Our electric grid is increasingly vulnerable to cyber attack, and if a nation-state or a terrorist group were successful in crippling our electric grid, it would have devastating consequences for our economy and our national defense. We’ve read news stories reporting allegations that spies may have penetrated the mechanisms that control our power supplies.

Cybersecurity experts report that the “smart grid” we are counting on to improve reliability and enhance consumer choices could also increase our exposure to hackers in places like China and Russia. Our defense community is concerned about possible electromagnetic attacks from terrorist or hostile countries. We must take substantive action to address the susceptibility of our electric systems to such attacks. The stakes are just too high for us to do nothing.

The GRID Act, Mr. Speaker, takes care of all these problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I appreciate the ranking member’s yielding additional time.

The GRID Act would shield both our bulk power system and the infrastruc-

ture serving critical defense facilities. The legislation authorizes the President to address imminent grid security threats through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, better known as FERC. It would give FERC the authority to issue notice-and-comment rule to address grid security vulnerabilities.

As Mr. MARKEY pointed out, this bill is revenue-neutral. It does not increase the Federal deficit in any shape, form, or fashion. It is worthy of support.

I want to repeat again, it came out the Energy and Commerce Committee 47-0. I hope the House will unanimously vote for this and send it to the other body.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for working with the majority in such a cooperative fashion. National defense is an area where we should be trying to cooperate, and this bill is a preeminent example of that happening in this Congress. And I want to thank him and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for creating that atmosphere which made it possible.

I think that this is a historic piece of legislation. Mr. WAXMAN and I and all of the Members on our side really do believe that this is the way Congress should work. I congratulate the gentleman for his work on it.

I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to say, this is an issue that we sat down together for the last, actually, couple of years examining the facts. Many of us that particularly live in areas—for me, the Midwest, coming from Michigan, we had a devastating tornado come through this weekend, and for many of us, myself included, our electricity went out for a number of hours. And then a number of times, particularly during the winter and even in the summer where these electric storms that come through, sometimes the electricity may be out for a couple of days.

We look to our friends down in Haiti who, many of them still may not have electricity after the devastating earthquake that hit there a number of months ago. Can you imagine if that happened here in this country, where, because of our grid vulnerabilities, you could be perhaps out of electricity for a year or 2, trying to get gasoline to get out of there, trying to get refrigeration for your food, trying to have a job, take care of your family?

Some of us read the book “The Road.” Lots of different scenarios that are out there. We need to be prepared. This bill moves us down that road.

And I again want to compliment my friend, Mr. MARKEY, to make sure that this legislation did move through. We had a lot of bipartisan support, a lot of eyes opened and ears too, particularly as we sat through some of those classified briefings. Let’s hope that the Senate moves quickly, the President signs

it swiftly, and, in fact, we can see legislation move to make sure that those scenarios remain that way and don’t become realities.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5026, the Grid Reliability and Infrastructure Defense—or GRID—Act.

As Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am well aware of the need to protect our Nation’s critical infrastructure.

Our Committee has held numerous classified briefings and public hearings on threats to the electric grid. Again and again, we received testimony from expert witnesses that our Nation’s electric grid has inadequate protections against cyber attacks and against significant disruptions from electromagnetic threats, EMP, such as solar storms and radio frequency devices.

Further, the Federal Government does not have the authority to ensure its security, nor has it partnered effectively with the private sector to do so.

Protecting our electric grid from EMP will require the best efforts from both government and industry. To date, the electric sector has had a difficult time protecting their assets from EMP threats because although the potential impacts are huge, the frequency of their occurrence is very low.

This is one of those cases where government intervention seems necessary to protect our most important national critical infrastructure.

Last year, I, along with my ranking member PETER KING and many other bipartisan members of our Committee introduced H.R. 2195 to give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission authority to require protections to be put in place for high impact, low frequency events.

H.R. 5026 is the product of collaborative work between this Committee and our colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee, most notably Chairman WAXMAN and Representatives MARKEY and BARROW.

Our electric grid is currently strained to capacity.

We saw during the Northeast Blackout of 2003 what can happen when the strained system finally breaks. That blackout interrupted electricity delivery to 55 million people in the U.S. and Canada. Luckily, major outages only lasted a day or so.

But just imagine what would happen if the power did not come back on for a week, or a month, or several months. What would happen?

An electromagnetic pulse could make such an incredible scenario a reality.

The one that most people have heard about is from a high altitude burst of a nuclear weapon.

Also of concern are smaller radio or microwave devices, usually termed “Intentional Electromagnetic Interference” or “IEMI”.

Of particular concern are “geomagnetically induced currents”, GIC, caused by solar activity.

A 2008 National Academy of Sciences report warned that our Sun will inevitably inflict a severe geomagnetic storm with the largest geographic footprint of any natural disaster. The damage caused by this event could be \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion, and recovery could take 4 to 10 years.

The next period of maximum solar activity is only two years away.

From a homeland security perspective, it is important that we take an “all hazards” approach to the risk and increase preparedness for both intentional and naturally occurring events.

While some may argue that the threat of a high-altitude nuclear weapon burst perpetrated by a rogue state or a terrorist group is remote, I do not discount it. Given the high-consequence nature of such an attack, I take it very seriously.

On the other hand, scientists tell us that the likelihood of a severe naturally occurring geomagnetic event capable of crippling our electric grid is 100 percent. It will happen; it is just a question of when.

GIC is a natural occurrence just like earthquakes, wildfires, tornadoes or hurricanes.

Similarly, geomagnetic storms occur from time to time as part of the natural activity of the Sun. One such storm, in 1989, disrupted power throughout most of Quebec, and resulted in auroras as far south as Texas.

With the significant investments we are making in “Green Energy” and the “Smart Grid”, we find ourselves at an opportune moment to protect our grid from an EMP and cyber attacks.

As we expand and improve our grid, we must also build in physical and cyber protections from the start, and we must retrofit key elements of the existing grid in order to protect it.

Federal authority and funding are needed if this effort is to succeed. H.R. 5026 represents a critical step forward in our efforts to meet these homeland security challenges and deserves support from this House.

Therefore, I urge Members to join me and support H.R. 5026.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5026, the Grid Reliability and Infrastructure Defense Act, and urge my colleagues to support it. I thank my colleague Chairman MARKEY for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

The GRID Act empowers the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in the event of a Presidential emergency declaration, to take actions needed to protect our grid.

I have said this before but it bears repeating: A modern society is characterized by the presence of three things: clean available water, properly functioning sewage and sanitation services, and electricity.

I would further assert that the way our present systems function, electricity is needed to power those other critical systems. So at a minimum, we rely on electricity to function as a modern society.

It is our very reliance on this infrastructure that makes it an obvious target for attack. We know that many of our adversaries—from terrorist groups to nation states—have and continue to develop capabilities that would allow them to attack and destroy our grid at a time of their choosing.

There are two significant threats to the electric grid. One is the threat of cyber attack. Many nation states, like Russia, China, North Korea, and Iran, have offensive cyber attack capabilities, while terrorist groups like Hezbollah and al Qaeda continue to work to develop capabilities to attack and destroy critical infrastructure like the electric grid through cyber means.

If you believe intelligence sources, our grid is already compromised. An April 2009 article in the Wall Street Journal cited intelligence sources who claim that the grid has already been penetrated by cyber intruders from Russia and China who are positioned to activate malicious code that could destroy portions of the grid at their command.

The other significant threat to the grid is the threat of a physical event that could come in the form of a natural or manmade Electromagnetic Pulse, known as EMP. The potentially devastating effects of an EMP to the grid are well documented.

During the Cold War, the U.S. government simulated the effects of EMP on our infrastructure, because of the threat of nuclear weapons, which emit an EMP after detonation. Though we may no longer fear a nuclear attack from Soviet Russia, rogue adversaries (including North Korea and Iran) possess and test high altitude missiles that could potentially cause a catastrophic pulse across the grid.

These are but two of the significant emerging threats we face in the 21st century. Our adversaries openly discuss using these capabilities against the United States. According to its “Cyber Warfare Doctrine,” China’s military strategy is designed to achieve global “electronic dominance” by 2050, to include the capability to disrupt financial markets, military and civilian communications capabilities, and the electric grid prior to the initiation of traditional military operations.

Cyber and physical attacks against the grid could both be catastrophic and incredibly destructive events, but they are not inevitable. Protections can—and must—be put in place ahead of time to mitigate the impact of these attacks.

The time for action is now, support the GRID Act and help ensure America’s future.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. I yield back the balance of my time with the urging of an “aye” vote by the Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5026, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system and electric infrastructure critical to the defense of the United States against cybersecurity and other threats and vulnerabilities.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD OCEAN DAY

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1330) recognizing June 8, 2010, as World Ocean Day, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1330

Whereas in 2008, the United Nations General Assembly decided that, as of 2009, June 8 would be designated by the United Nations as “World Ocean Day”;

Whereas many countries have celebrated World Ocean Day following the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992;

Whereas World Ocean Day allows us the yearly opportunity to pay tribute to the ocean for what it provides;

Whereas we have an individual and collective duty, both nationally and internationally, to protect, conserve, maintain, and rebuild our ocean and its resources;

Whereas our present ocean stewardship is necessary to provide for current and future generations;

Whereas the world depends on the health of our ocean for a full range of ecological, economic, educational, scientific, social, cultural, nutritional, and recreational benefits;

Whereas the ocean is linked to adaptation to climate and other environmental change, foreign policy, and national and homeland security;

Whereas we must ensure accountability for our actions, and serve as a model country promoting balanced, productive, efficient, sustainable, and informed ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes use, management, and conservation within the global community; and

Whereas our ocean is in need of strong policies that support ecosystem-based management, coastal and marine spatial planning, informed science-based decision making and improved understanding, government coordination, regional ecosystem protection and restoration, enhanced water quality and sustainable practices on land, changing conditions in the Arctic as well as ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes observations and infrastructure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes World Ocean Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I’m happy to rise in support of House Resolution 1330. This measure recognizes June 8, 2010, as World Ocean Day.

World Ocean Day offers the opportunity to celebrate the wonders of the underwater world and look carefully at our interactions with the sea.

The timing of this measure is critical. Today we find ourselves in the midst of the worst ocean oil disaster in our Nation’s history. With our addiction to oil jeopardizing the vibrant and economically vital marine life of America’s seas, we are being reminded daily of the often-forgotten value of

these resources and our responsibility to protect them.

The world's oceans cover more than 70 percent of our planet's surface, and the rich web of life that they support is the result of hundreds of millions of years of evolution. Great human civilizations, from the Egyptians to the Polynesians, relied on the sea for commerce and transport.

And now, in the 21st century, our fate is as tied to the oceans as ever. We still rely on fish for a significant portion of our daily protein needs. And more than \$500 billion of the world's economy is tied to ocean-based industries, such as coastal tourism and shipping.

But all is not well in the sea. Increased pressures from overfishing, habitat destruction, pollution, and introduction of invasive alien species have combined in recent decades to threaten the diversity of life in our oceans.

The first observance of World Ocean Day will allow us to highlight the many ways in which oceans contribute to society. It is also an opportunity to recognize the considerable challenges we face in maintaining the capacity to regulate global climate, supply essential ecosystem services, and provide sustainable livelihoods and safe recreation.

As the oil continues to spill into the gulf, it is time to recognize a World Ocean Day and take the first critical steps to saving this vital resource.

House Resolution 1330 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from California, Representative SAM FARR, on May 5, 2010. The measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on May 20, 2010. The measure has the support of over 50 Members of the House.

I thank the gentleman from California for introducing this measure, and I'd also like to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their support for the bill. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1330, recognizing June 8, 2010, as World Ocean Day.

It is particularly fitting that today this resolution gives us the opportunity to take some time and appreciate the beauty of our oceans and to think about ways that we can work to protect our oceans for generations to come.

All Americans, as well as people from around the world, realize the importance of oceans. Millions of people enjoy playing, boating, surfing, fishing, or simply being along the beachscape and along our oceans. Oceans fascinate many children who learn about the interesting aspects of the oceans and the animals that live under the sea.

Certainly, in light of the national crisis that is currently occurring in the

gulf with the oil leak, this resolution gives us context in which to understand the risks from the delayed response that is occurring to stop the leak in the gulf.

We rely on oceans every day for our regular way of life. Oceans provide thousands of jobs for fishermen, sailors, and many other professions. All Americans are served by oceans in numerous ways, including for food and transport for the vast array of goods that are transported by cargo ships across oceans.

Mr. Speaker, our oceans are an incredibly precious resource, and we should protect them for the future. I ask that my colleagues join in support of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, Representative FARR.

□ 1130

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, which I sponsored with many other Members of Congress. And I would first of all like to thank the committee and the leadership they provided in a bipartisan fashion to bring this bill to the floor.

As has been stated, the ocean is our largest public trust. It covers two-thirds of the planet. It's responsible for one-third of the total gross domestic product of the United States. It is closely linked to our day-to-day activities and, frankly, to the success of our Nation.

Tom Friedman said, "A crisis is a terrible thing to waste." We cannot let the crisis that has happened in the gulf pass us by. We've faced disasters in this country before, and we have moved to act. After Rachel Carson wrote "Silent Spring" in 1962, and the Santa Barbara oil spill happened in 1969, the environmental movement took a strong hold in the United States. Congress followed up by adopting the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the National Environmental Policy Act in short order. We will debate the acts that we have to take following the crisis in the gulf, but today we are joined in unanimous thought that the ocean is important, and it warrants its recognition.

We might say it's a very salty week here in Washington. June is the National Oceans Month. This week is the Capitol Hill Oceans Week, where members of the ocean interests and science community come to Washington to petition their government. And yesterday was World Ocean Day. For over a month now, the Nation has been experiencing the worst marine disaster in history.

World Ocean Day was first recognized in 1992's Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, and has been celebrated unofficially ever since. The United Nations took official recognition of the day last year. I am proud to lead the effort here in Congress this year.

The resolution that we are adopting emphasizes we have an individual and

collective duty, both nationally and internationally, to be ocean stewards. The resolution also petitions the President to set priorities using his Ocean Policy Task Force. I will continue in my role as representing the coast of California and one of the marine science leading geography areas in the world of marine science to bring to this floor issues important to the ocean. But right now I want to join my colleagues in celebrating that we all agree that it's important to recognize the oceans.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as Congress takes this time to recognize World Ocean Day, I think it is absolutely appropriate for us to ask the administration for answers on the gulf oil leak and the tragedy that is occurring there. I think the American people are outraged, and they want to know how did this happen, they want to know how is it going to be stopped, and how is it going to be cleaned up. I think the administration needs to tell us what their game plan is and what their actions are.

Currently, it is as if the administration is merely telling what BP is saying. And I think the American people want to know, and as Congress takes this action, it would be appropriate for the administration to step forward and say how did this happen, how are we going to stop this, and how are we going to clean it up, and how are we going to make certain this doesn't happen again. I know that in Ohio people look down to the gulf with just outrage of the risk that is occurring to wildlife, our beaches. And they want to know what is this administration going to do, what is the plan, and how is this going to be stopped.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Congressman FARR, thank you for your leadership on this. This is not a new issue for you. I remember your days in the California legislature, where you carried such legislation. You do represent one of the most pristine and one of the most precious parts of the California coast, the Monterey Bay. Therefore, it's appropriate for you to carry and it's appropriate for this Congress to act on this resolution, recognizing World Ocean Day and, beyond that, recognizing the critical importance of oceans to all of us.

It is the birthplace of life. It is the place where we find our climate, our oxygen, a lot of our food, and our commerce. It's also the place that we have over the years trashed. Trash is flowing into the ocean, sewage is flowing into the ocean, pollution of all kinds, and now the ultimate pollution of a blowout of an oil well in the Gulf of Mexico.

It's time for us to not only pay attention to the ocean, which this resolution does; it's also time for us to protect the oceans. We know that climate change,

the increasing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is leading to the acidification of oceans. And that will kill much of the life of the ocean if it were to continue to increase.

What are we doing about it? Well, we are recognizing it today. We will take this as step one. Yes, the administration needs to be forthcoming with information. But we also need to rein in the oil industry and make sure that any drilling in the oceans is done in a maximum safe way. For the west coast, I have authored the West Coast Ocean Protection Act that would prohibit new leases off the west coast of California, Oregon, and Washington. That is the maximum protection. More needs to be done. This is a starting point.

This is a recognition of our responsibility as Members of Congress to take action not only with a resolution recognizing this day, but with solid laws that require the protection and provide the protection necessary for the ocean.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, again as we take up this resolution for World Ocean Day, America has questions for this administration on how they are going to stop this leak, how we are going to protect our oceans and the wildlife, and how this is going to be cleaned up.

You know, most administrations when they take office say, We are ready for the job day one. Well, day one was a year-and-a-half ago, and we still have a crisis in the gulf, and people want to know, Well, where is the administration? We are on day 51 of the leak down in the gulf. Day 51.

Perhaps in addition to World Ocean Day, every day Congress should pass a resolution proclaiming a day in honor of the tragedy that's occurring down in the gulf. Day 51 and we still don't have an answer, we don't know how this is going to be stopped, we don't know what the administration's plans are, and we don't know what the administration's plans are for cleaning this up.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the resolution, June 8 as World Ocean Day. But for the past 50 days, and for the next 6 months at least, every other day is going to be "ruin our oceans day."

We like to think, well, this is all about BP. I think we have to go a little bit further. We have to understand that we have been pursuing a way of life that is not sustainable. It's not sustainable for us as human beings; it's not sustainable for our planet.

So we can be here today to talk about the oceans, and we should; but we have to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that our oceans receive billions of gallons of runoff flows, pesticides, metals like mercury and lead, massive amounts of fertilizer, volatile organic compounds, countless other chemicals.

Even before the Deepwater disaster, this runoff caused the single biggest dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico.

Our oceans are absorbing the malfeasance of oil companies who are not only responsible for at least three separate major oil gushers as we speak, but are responsible as being one of two major contributors causing climate change. And we are subsidizing them with taxpayers' money. Our oceans are absorbing the malfeasance of coal companies, the other major fossil fuel contributor to climate change. For decades the oceans have been our repository for the greenhouse gases that come mostly from the burning of fossil fuel. The result is that oceans have grown more acidic. Coral is dying; underwater temperature patterns are shifting, undermining entire ecosystems.

There are signs our oceans have reached the limit. Some studies indicate oceans won't be able to absorb any more, if any, greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere. That only increases the urgency with which we must act to achieve a carbon-free and even nuclear-free energy portfolio.

But the ultimate challenge that we have about upholding the environmental integrity of our oceans comes because we have really disassociated ourselves from nature. We see nature as being out there. We see nature as not even being a part of us. And because we are avoiding our responsibility to protect God's creation, the price we are going to be paying in the future will keep getting higher: oceans that are poisoned, a planet ruined, and all of life threatened with extinction.

So we can keep temporizing about what's going on in the gulf, but the fact of the matter is that sooner or later we must come to an accounting with the kind of energy that we are using and the damage it does to the environment and to the human race and all other life on the planet.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. KUCINICH from Ohio's comments on the issues of how we need to look at how we are treating the environment. And as we are into day 51 of this crisis in the gulf, Congress has begun to have hearings, the House and the Senate, asking questions about what happened. But I think the administration needs to come forward and give some serious answers to the American people. As people look to the news and to the Web cams of the leak, they want to know from this administration what's the answer. How is this going to be stopped? How is this going to be addressed? How is it going to be cleaned up?

Fifty-one days into this, we don't know yet how this is going to be stopped or what manner by which it should be stopped. We are still listening to BP give us the answers instead of the administration telling us, well, what is the standard? What should be happening? How should we be protecting the coast?

And it makes you wonder, a year-and-a-half into this administration, well, how are we doing on the other oil rigs that are there? Is this administration prepared in determining whether or not the other oil rigs currently represent a threat? What inspections are they doing? What compliance are they doing?

As Congress passes World Ocean Day, the administration should pause and turn to the American people and give us some answers as to what their response is going to be to this 51 days into a terrible crisis down in the gulf.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I am intrigued with my colleague from Ohio's approach, because when the other team was in charge, we had a series of programs that undercut the ability to have government equipped moving forward: the scandals in the MMS, the appointment of people literally from the industry to sort of look at their former colleagues, people who were literally in bed with the people that they were supposed to regulate.

A series of efforts, the litany that we have heard from our colleagues when they were in charge was to cut back on regulation, to move it faster, to do more drill, baby, drill. And with all due respect, I think looking at the history of 10 years of moving in the other direction, to now somehow fault the administration, who inherited an unparalleled economic collapse, problems with EPA, with MMS around the whole array of areas that are a consequence of policies that were put in place by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

I feel it's somewhat ironic that we are celebrating Ocean Day on the 51st day of the disaster. I am hopeful that it is an area that we are not somehow going to spend—I am happy to go toe to toe with my friend in terms of what the Republicans did and their policies to strip the Federal Government of the ability to move forward, but I think what we need to do is talk about where we are going forward to reduce our reliance on imported oil and domestically produced fossil fuels.

We need to move to a cleaner, greener approach, where we have more energy efficiency. We absolutely need to be aggressive in making sure that the laws are enforced. We need to have people who stop being apologists for the industry, whether it's BP or mining disasters, and move forward with a new era of more efficient-energy use, and respect for the oceans.

I am honored to be on the floor with my colleague Mr. FARR, who has been a champion for as long as I have been in Congress in this area that deserves far more attention, far more resources, far more work on the part of the Congress.

I would hope that respect for the oceans, that research and protections

would be something that brings us together so that not only do we avoid disasters like this in the future, but we are able to do a better job with the wide range of areas that are going to make such a difference for the future of the planet.

Mr. TURNER. With all due respect to the gentleman from Oregon, since the Democrats have been in charge of the House for the past 3½ years, if there were any regulatory or legislative issues or resolutions that needed to be passed, certainly we would have seen those and they would have moved forward out of this House. Unfortunately, what we see out of this House is a resolution for World Ocean Day, a resolution for World Ocean Day while we have this crisis going on down in the gulf and the administration is still not giving us answers as to how is this going to be addressed.

□ 1145

The big question that everybody has in the news is not what is BP doing or what is it going to be doing next or is the fix that they currently are pursuing going to work, but what is this administration's answer to how this should be addressed, what should be done. This administration has been in office for 1½ years. This crisis has been going on for 51 days. Surely in the past 51 days the administration should be able to step forward and give the American people a clear answer as to how did this happen, how is it going to be stopped, and how are we going to clean this up. This is something that I think everyone, as we pause for World Ocean Day, would certainly pause for those answers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman CAPPS.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise today to express my strong support for H. Res. 1330, a resolution recognizing June 8 as World Ocean Day.

I want to thank my colleague and dear friend SAM FARR, who represents a neighboring district to mine on the central coast of California, for introducing this important resolution of which I am a proud cosponsor.

We are a water planet, Mr. Speaker. The oceans cover 71 percent of the Earth's surface and contain 97 percent of the planet's water. They regulate our climate. They regulate our weather. We depend on them for the air we breathe, for protein in our diets, for our quality of life.

Yesterday, the international community celebrated World Ocean Day. Now, more than ever, it is time for us to pay tribute to our oceans and to their resources.

Two national commissions have found our oceans are under increasing pressure. They are showing signs of serious decline from oxygen-deprived dead zones to depleted fish populations to contaminated beach waters, and now

we must add a massive oil spill to the list. This disastrous gulf oil spill is the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history.

There is no doubt our addiction to oil jeopardizes the vibrant and economically important marine life of our world's oceans. We are being reminded every day of the often-forgotten value of these resources, and it's our responsibility to protect them.

A national ocean policy is needed, Mr. Speaker, perhaps now more than ever. Such a policy would ensure that activities occurring off our shores, like offshore drilling, that these activities meet the basic requirements of protecting, maintaining, and restoring our ocean ecosystems and resources. President Obama has already erected a task force to develop, with public input, recommendations for a national ocean policy, which are expected soon. This is an important first step that will better protect our oceans.

But there's another step that Congress can take. So I urge my colleagues to join with me not only in supporting this important resolution recognizing World Ocean Day, but as our colleague from Oregon has just stated, moving forward, taking the collective responsibility, the stewardship that we share to defend and care for our water planet.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker indicated that the President has pulled together a task force for a national ocean policy and is looking for public input. I think we know what that public input is. It's, Mr. President, tell the American people how this leak is going to be stopped. Tell us how this cleanup is going to occur, and tell us how this is going to be avoided in the future. The public input is, Stop the leak.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. I now yield 3 minutes to the author of this resolution, Representative FARR, the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. I appreciate the support for this bill on both sides of the aisle.

I would just like to address that although the resolved clause is very simple, it recognizes for the first time that Congress recognizes for the first time that we ought to recognize a day when the whole world is trying to recognize the ocean. I mean, it does cover two-thirds of our planet, and it is very important to the ecosystem and the health and well-being of mankind to have a healthy ocean.

And that's, you know, in a way, as the minority speaker said, that's not a big deal when there's a huge crisis going on, but it's the first time Congress has recognized the ocean in that sense. So it is important as a first step. I think what's more important and answers some of the questions that you raise, not just the questions of cleanup in the gulf but a much bigger question that a lot of us in Congress have been asking, is: Where is our national ocean policy?

We have had policy about clean water and how we want to govern that and

set up a process for determining how we can ensure that water that we drink and that we disperse into the oceans is clean. We have national policy on air quality of the air we breathe, but we have no national policy on health of the oceans or even use of the oceans for fishing, for mining, for other kinds of purposes. And that is what's lacking.

We're governing in a crisis because we have an oil spill. And what I respect the committee in doing in their unanimous consent is looking at these "whereases" in this bill that really calls for these bigger policies so that we don't get into this problematic area, kind of going at things blindly. And I think that's what really the importance is here.

This bill coming at this time—it was introduced before the oil spill began but certainly has developed a lot of popularity because people want to say, Yes, we do recognize the oceans. And I think this is a first start for Congress to really look at a comprehensive package of issues.

We can go into the debates, going to get into a lot of things you heard today. But it's very important that we together, in a unanimous, bipartisan way, look at the fact that the ocean is a very critical resource to the well-being of the world, much less the well-being of the United States. And I appreciate the bipartisan support to bring this bill to the floor, and I ask that we have a unanimous vote on it.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as Congress takes up World Ocean Day, we are 51 days into a crisis in the gulf where this administration, 1½ years into this administration, still has not provided the American people with answers as to how will this leak be stopped, how will this be cleaned up, how will this be avoided in the future. The American people, as we take up World Ocean Day, pause, looking at the 51 days of the continuing crisis in the gulf, and look for answers.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1330, introduced by my colleague Mr. SAM FARR of California. The Resolution calls upon the United States to recognize World Oceans Day, where we pay tribute to the oceans for what it provides and recognize our duty to protect, conserve, maintain, and rebuild our ocean and its resources so it may continue to be enjoyed by future generations.

As the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, I fully support House Resolution 1330, which brings attention to the importance of our world's oceans in our cultural, social, economic and scientific life. Since 1992, the world has celebrated World Oceans Day, with the first celebrated at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. This year's theme, "Oceans of Life," is fitting as our oceans contain great biodiversity that sustain our human population.

The people in my home district of Guam fully understand the significance of our oceans. As an island community in the Western Pacific, our economy relies on the natural beauty of our beaches to support our tourism industry. Understanding that our beaches

allow both residents and tourists to engage in recreational activities, the people of Guam remain responsible environmental stewards. The oceans surrounding Guam, which continue to sustain life on the island, are a central part of Chamorro culture. This appreciation of the ocean by all of Guam's residents is rooted in an understanding that it is important to protect our natural resources, which include our coral reefs, fish and marine life.

Unfortunately, the health of our oceans is threatened at all levels. From climate change affecting our ocean's biodiversity to the most recent oil disaster in the Gulf Coast, we must continue to work to address these issues so that future generations are able to experience the educational, recreational and economic benefits of our world's oceans.

With that, I ask all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support House Resolution 1330, recognizing World Ocean Day.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1330, a resolution recognizing June 8 as World Ocean Day. Hawaii is the only state in the nation that is surrounded entirely by ocean, giving us a unique appreciation for the vast resource that is the Pacific Ocean. Almost every household good in Hawaii was shipped over the ocean. Our state's economy relies on our harbors—large and small—and the beaches that draw visitors to Hawaii. The ocean provides recreational activities such as surfing, swimming, and fishing for our residents and visitors to enjoy. It would be difficult to find an aspect of life in Hawaii that is not somehow affected by the Pacific Ocean.

The Native Hawaiian culture is also deeply tied to the ocean. Polynesian explorers discovered Hawaii traveling tremendous distance in canoes, long before the so-called "discovery" of Hawaii by Captain Cook. The Kumulipo chant, known as the Hawaiian creation chant, places the origin of life in the oceans, beginning with the coral polyp.

Hawaii is home to the world's most ancient seal, the Hawaiian monk seal. My district includes the largest marine protected area in the United States, the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, as well as one of the most important breeding grounds for the endangered Humpback Whale.

The people of Hawaii have always relied on the ocean, but the situation in the Gulf Coast illustrates that the oceans belong to the world. Countries have political boundaries, but the ocean and its denizens do not. The oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico has devastated that region and now threatens the entire East Coast because of the Loop Current, the Gulf Stream, and other ocean currents.

People in landlocked states also depend on the oceans, which absorb up to a quarter of the world's carbon dioxide. As humans have increased their carbon dioxide output in recent decades, the ocean has grown increasingly acidic. Over the last five years, we have learned that this acidification endangers coral, algae, shellfish, and other small organisms that support the base of the food chain.

What happens to the ocean happens to the world. Whether landlocked or surrounded by ocean, we all depend on the benefits of healthy oceans. Fish stocks, ocean currents, and carbon dioxide do not abide by political boundaries. We, too, must work across our borders to unite with other nations in order to be careful and conscientious stewards of the

ocean. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to recognize June 8 as World Ocean Day.

H.R. 5278

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRESIDENT RONALD W. REAGAN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 405 West Second Street in Dixon, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building".

Mr. TURNER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1330, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PRESIDENT RONALD W. REAGAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5278) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 405 West Second Street in Dixon, Illinois, as the "President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Govern-

ment Reform, it is my great privilege as a member of the California delegation to rise in support of H.R. 5278. This measure designates the United States postal building located at 405 West Second Street in Dixon, Illinois, as the "President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building."

President Reagan hardly needs an introduction on this floor. Many of those who knew President Reagan referred to him as "the Great Communicator." Thus, it is very fitting that we commemorate his legacy through the naming of this post office.

The son of a shoe salesman, Ronald Reagan was born in Illinois in 1911. He was a construction worker, a lifeguard, radio announcer, and actor. After serving in the Air Force, he returned to acting before successfully running for California Governor, despite never having held public office before.

President Reagan successfully obtained legislation to stimulate economic growth, curb inflation, and increase employment. His contributions on behalf of freedom around the world are unparalleled since the end of World War II. There is no more Cold War. There is no more Berlin Wall, and it was because of the leadership of President Ronald Reagan. He was instrumental in bringing the breath of freedom to millions of people around the world who had spent decades under the yoke of tyranny. President Reagan left a lasting imprint on American politics, diplomacy, culture, and economics.

As a California resident, I am honored to support H.R. 5278. It was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative BILL FOSTER, on May 12, 2010. The measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported by unanimous consent on May 6, 2010. The measure has the support of the entire Illinois delegation.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this measure, and I would also like to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their support for the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5278, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 405 West Second Street in Dixon, Illinois, as the "President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building."

Ronald Reagan was born in Illinois in 1911. He attended high school in Dixon, Illinois, after which he worked his way through Eureka College. While at Eureka College, Mr. Reagan began acting in school plays, along with his studies of economics and sociology.

After graduating college, he had a life led with achievements. He was a sports radio announcer, a noted actor appearing in 53 films, two-time president of the Screen Actors Guild, and host of a long-running television series.

As a self-described citizen politician in 1966, he was elected as the 33rd Governor of California by over a million votes. He was then reelected Governor in 1970. His many successes while Governor in California made him into a national political figure as he became a standard bearer within the Republican Party.

After a failed attempt to receive the Republican nomination in 1976, he was selected by his party and was elected by the American people to President in 1980. Shortly after taking office as President of the United States in 1981, he was shot and wounded by a would-be assassin but soon recovered and returned to work showing his trademark of grace under fire.

During Ronald Reagan's Presidential terms from 1981 to 1988, he dealt successfully with a number of momentous economic, political, and foreign affairs challenges. Even as he was faced with matters involving the global interests of the United States in various areas of the world, he did not neglect serious problems in the Western Hemisphere. His style of seeking peace through strength while in office proved to be a tactic that was highly successful and very popular with the American people.

Ronald Reagan remains one of our most popular and beloved Presidents. His two terms as President were marked with many achievements, none greater than being a catalyst for the end of the Cold War. One of Ronald Reagan's most memorable sayings, "Trust, but verify," remains appropriate for us today.

His life was a truly unique American story as he rose from humble beginnings, persevered through hardships, and enjoyed the bounty of dedication and hard work, which was indeed a movie script story that became reality.

Madam Speaker, Ronald Reagan embodied the American spirit, the American Dream. And as he said in his farewell address to the Nation in January of 1989, he spoke of the determination to rediscover our values and our common sense. Ronald Reagan trusted and believed in "We, the people," and I believe he was one of America's greatest Presidents.

And today his statue, which was placed in the Capitol dome, includes pieces of the Berlin Wall which he called to be torn down, ending the grip of communism in Europe.

I ask all Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, 6 years ago today, President Ronald Reagan lay in State in the Capitol Rotunda, a high and fitting honor for this consequential President and native son of my congressional district. Today, I bring to the floor a far more modest

tribute, a bill that would designate the post office in his boyhood hometown of Dixon, Illinois, the President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building.

Born in Tampico, Illinois, in 1911 and raised in Dixon, President Reagan spent his life upholding the strong values of small-town America, but it is easy to overlook the humble Midwestern origins of a man whose career took him from Hollywood to the White House. In his autobiography, President Reagan said of Dixon, "It was a small universe where I learned the standards and values that would guide me the rest of my life."

While living in Dixon, President Reagan attended grade school and high school. Decades before standing at the Brandenburg Gate, he stood guard at the beach in Lowell Park where, according to local lore, he saved the lives of 77 swimmers on the Rock River.

For the centennial of President Reagan's birth next year, the communities of Tampico and Dixon are planning numerous commemorative activities to honor this local hero and American icon. There will be a gala event in Tampico in February, followed later that month by the premiere of the "Reagan Suite," an arrangement commissioned by the Dixon Municipal Band and Reagan Centennial Commission. Later in the year, Dixon will host an Alzheimer's Walk and education workshop in honor of the late President.

With the help of my colleagues in the House, we can contribute in a small way to the outstanding efforts of many committed local officials who will make Dixon and Tampico true focal points of the Reagan centennial in 2011.

This is a truly bipartisan bill, with 41 Democratic and Republican cosponsors representing congressional districts from across the country. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TURNER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5278.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

STAFF SERGEANT FRANK T. CARVILL AND LANCE CORPORAL MICHAEL A. SCHWARZ POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5133) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5133

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT FRANK T. CARVILL AND LANCE CORPORAL MICHAEL A. SCHWARZ POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, it is my honor to rise in support of H.R. 5133. This measure designates the United States Postal Building located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building.

Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill of Carlstadt, New Jersey, was killed on June 4, 2004, when his convoy was attacked by improvised explosive devices and rocket-propelled grenades in Baghdad. At 51, Carvill, an Army sergeant with the New Jersey National Guard, was among the oldest soldiers to die in Iraq. He was killed when his Humvee was ambushed in the Sadr City district of Baghdad in an attack that also claimed the lives of four other Guard members.

Carvill had escaped both terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center where he worked as a paralegal. In 1993, he

helped a co-worker down 54 floors to safety. On September 11, 2001, he left the north tower moments before one of the hijacked planes plowed into the building.

Carvill was a voracious reader who loved politics, an outdoorsman who enjoyed kayaking, and a trusted friend who had the same buddies for 30 years.

Marine Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz was killed in action on November 27, 2006, from wounds suffered while conducting combat operations in al Anbar Province in Iraq. The son and brother of auto mechanics, Schwarz graduated from Becton Regional High School in 2004. Along with his brother, Frank, Michael Schwarz served in the local volunteer fire department. Their father, Kenneth, headed the department for years.

Friends and relatives remembered Michael Schwarz as fun-loving and outgoing. Friends recalled off-road outings in Schwarz's customized Jeep. Most of all, there was Schwarz's love of the military and his desire to enlist in the Marines, a wish he expressed even when he was a young child.

H.R. 5133 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative ROTHMAN, on April 22, 2010. The measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on May 6, 2010. The measure has the support of the entire New Jersey delegation.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for introducing this measure, and I would also like to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their support for the bill.

Madam Speaker, the lives of Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz stand as a testament to the courage and dedication of all our brave servicemen and -women who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation. Let us pay tribute to their lives through the passage of this legislation, H.R. 5133, to designate the Carlstadt, New Jersey, postal facility in their honor.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 5133.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to express my support of H.R. 5133, designating the post office located at 331 First Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building.

Carlstadt, New Jersey, is home to 6,000 residents and is barely 5 blocks long. Losing two of their own in the line of duty truly affected everyone in the close-knit environment.

Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz had very different careers; however, the unfortunate similarity of the two was their fate. Both were killed in ac-

tion while bravely serving the United States in the war on terror.

Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz is described by friends as an all-American and fun-loving guy, knowing what was at stake when he joined the Marines right out of Henry P. Becton Regional High School in 2004. Schwarz was passionate about the Marines. It was his dream. His father recalls, "Since he was maybe 10 years old he didn't like regular clothes; it was always Army clothes. Even when he graduated high school, under his cap and gown he had his camos on."

He was said to have understood the danger of being in the Marines and was ready to face it head-on. He loved his country, the idea of being a soldier and preserving freedom. He willingly sacrificed his life to better the people of Iraq and to protect the United States. On November 27, 2006, at the age of 20, Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz was killed while conducting combat operations in the Iraqi province of Anbar. He was part of the Marine Expeditionary Force of the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division.

Army National Guard Sergeant Frank Carvill, a paralegal, left his office at the World Trade Center minutes before the first jetliner hit the towers on September 11, 2001, and was not injured in the terrorist attack. Years before, he had helped assist others in the 1993 bombings of the north tower office. He was an American patriot, assisting others and making personal sacrifices to help those in need while a civilian and as well as being in the military.

Having been enlisted for 20 years in the National Guard, Carvill was 51 when his unit was deployed to Iraq. Carvill was a member of the National Guard's task force in Baghdad to protect convoys and set up traffic control points.

Always willing to help, the day he was to head home on leave, Carvill gave up his seat on the plane to another soldier who had a family emergency. Sadly, on June 4, 2004, the same day he gave his seat to a fellow soldier, Sergeant Frank Carvill was killed when his Humvee was ambushed in a suburb of Baghdad.

The families express that both men made a personal choice to go to Iraq because they believed that what they were doing was right. These men were true American patriots.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill honoring these brave and courageous men who gave their lives to protect and preserve our great Nation. They sacrificed their lives in defense of freedom, and they should forever be remembered.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of this resolution, the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative ROTHMAN.

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentle-

ship on this matter and for the very kind words you said about these two heroes, and I'd like to associate myself with your words, as well as the gentleman from Ohio's words which were equally eloquent and true. These were great American heroes who lost their lives defending our country and our country's interests in Iraq.

I wanted to take a few moments, Madam Speaker, to share with you a bit of the pain that the people of Carlstadt still feel in their hearts when they think about the loss of these two citizens. This matter was brought to my attention by a friend, indicating to me that the families would be sympathetic and would be honored if this post office was renamed in honor of Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz. When I called the mayor of the town and I said, Is this true, I don't want to intrude on anyone's privacy, and he assured me that this was, in fact, the case.

As was said before, the town of Carlstadt, New Jersey, is only a few miles from what were the twin towers, and my district in northeastern New Jersey suffered a number of lost lives on that terrible day on 9/11, and then, again, we suffered the loss of these two individuals.

Memorial Day just passed, and I remember saying to all of our veterans and all of our young people gathered at these ceremonies, why is Memorial Day important, and in a sense, why would it be important to rename this local post office after these two individuals. It is not just so that we have a daily reminder in Carlstadt, New Jersey, of the heroism and sacrifice of these two brave individuals—and certainly, we hope and expect that the renaming of this post office will have that effect—but also, Madam Speaker, it will be to remind everyone, whether they knew these two fine heroes or not, of the price of liberty for all of us here in America, paid not only by these two outstanding men but by every man and woman who has paid the ultimate price to defend our country.

So I am indeed honored and proud to have the opportunity to express the sentiment of the people of Carlstadt, New Jersey, who want the families to know, who want their fellow Americans to know, and who want the world to know how proud they are of these two men and that we still live in a country with brave men and women like Army Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Marine Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz, people willing to defend our Nation and protect the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Mr. TURNER. I yield back the balance of our time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5133.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING CLINTON COUNTY, OHIO

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1121) congratulating Clinton County and the county seat of Wilmington, Ohio, on the occasion of their bicentennial anniversaries.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1121

Whereas Clinton County, originally known as the Virginia Military District because it had been set aside to reward the soldiers of the Revolutionary War, was established on February 19, 1810, 7 years after Ohio was admitted into the Union as the 17th State;

Whereas Clinton County was named after George Clinton, one of the Founding Fathers, and the fourth Vice President of the United States;

Whereas Clinton County was a station on the Underground Railroad prior to the Civil War, and a destination for thousands of persons escaping slavery and seeking freedom;

Whereas the county seat of Clinton County is located in Wilmington, a community founded in 1810 and settled by the Dutch, German, English, and Scotch-Irish pioneer stock, as well as by the Society of Friends (Quakers) who migrated to southwest Ohio from Virginia and North Carolina because of their opposition to slavery;

Whereas Clinton County is home to 2 outstanding institutions of higher learning that have prepared generations of students, past and present, for a successful future;

Whereas Southern State Community College is a 2-year institution serving a 5-county rural area where students seeking specific career training acquire the skills and knowledge they need to succeed in the workforce;

Whereas Wilmington College is a 4-year career-oriented liberal arts institution, founded by the Quakers in 1870, that is dedicated to the intellectual, emotional, physical, and spiritual development of its students;

Whereas Clinton County is home to Clinton Memorial Hospital, a community-based rural health facility that has been a leading provider of compassionate, accessible, quality health care to individuals and families in Clinton County and the surrounding region for almost 60 years;

Whereas Clinton County is home to the Murphy Theatre, a local historic treasure and community center that is located in the heart of downtown Wilmington;

Whereas the Murphy Theater was built in 1918 by Charles Webb Murphy, the owner of the Chicago Cubs, and it continues to host a wide range of events;

Whereas Clinton County is home to Cowan Lake State Park, a popular recreational

haven that was once a stronghold of the Miami and Shawnee Indians;

Whereas the park offers families an opportunity to enjoy a variety of outdoor activities that include sailing, swimming, hiking, fishing, hunting, and camping;

Whereas Clinton County holds the distinction of being the birthplace of one of the Nation's favorite desserts, the banana split;

Whereas the banana split was invented at Hazard's Drug Store in Wilmington, in 1907;

Whereas each summer, the city of Wilmington hosts the annual Banana Split Festival, a 2-day weekend event celebrated on the second full weekend of June; and

Whereas Clinton County today is home to approximately 43,200 residents in an area that is known to be one of the best places in the United States to live and raise a family: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the significant history of Clinton County and the county seat of Wilmington, Ohio;

(2) congratulates the citizens of Clinton County and Wilmington, Ohio, on the occasion of their bicentennial anniversaries; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available enrolled copies of this resolution to Clinton County and the county seat of Wilmington, Ohio, for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1121, a measure congratulating Clinton County, Ohio, and its county seat of Wilmington on their bicentennial.

House Resolution 1121 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Representative MICHAEL TURNER, on February 25, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on May 20, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of 50 Members of the House.

Madam Speaker, the history of Clinton County plays a strong part in the history of our country. It was originally known as the Virginia Military District because it had been set aside to reward the soldiers of the Revolutionary War. The county was established on February 19, 1810, 7 years after Ohio was admitted into the Union as the 17th State.

It takes its name, Clinton County, from George Clinton, the fourth Vice President of the United States and one of our Founding Fathers. Before the Civil War later that century, Clinton

County would be a station of the Underground Railroad, providing refuge to thousands of people seeking to escape the horrors of slavery.

Today, Clinton County is home to about 43,200 residents. And let us acknowledge them today as we celebrate the bicentennial of their historic home.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1121, congratulating Clinton County and the county seat of Wilmington, Ohio, on the occasion of their bicentennial anniversaries.

For 200 years now, Clinton County, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, has been an interesting part of American history. What is now Clinton County was initially called the Virginia Military District because the government had reserved the land to give veterans of the Revolutionary War as a reward for their service.

Clinton County was established in 1810 and was named Clinton County in honor of George Clinton. Clinton was one of America's Founding Fathers and served as Vice President under both Thomas Jefferson and James Madison.

Clinton County was a very important part of the anti-slavery movement before the Civil War because it had a station that was part of the Underground Railroad, helping thousands of slaves escape.

Also, a less serious aspect of Clinton County's history is that it is the place where the first banana split was created. And every year Wilmington has its annual Banana Split Festival.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my Ohio colleagues, all of whom are original cosponsors of this resolution, and thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their support in moving this bill through the committee process.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and congratulate the more than 43,000 residents of Clinton County on the bicentennial anniversary of their county.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1121.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1381) recognizing the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, as the only museum in the Nation dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1381

Whereas the National Museum of American Jewish History will illustrate how the freedom of America and its associated choices, challenges, and responsibilities fostered an environment in which Jewish Americans have made and continue to make extraordinary contributions in all facets of American life;

Whereas the mission of the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, is to connect Jews more closely to their heritage and to inspire in people of all backgrounds a greater appreciation for the diversity of the American experience and the freedoms to which all Americans aspire;

Whereas the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, was founded in 1976 by members of historic Congregation Mikveh Israel, itself established in 1740 and known as the "Synagogue of the American Revolution";

Whereas the National Museum of American Jewish History has attracted a broad audience to its public programs, while exploring American Jewish identity through lectures, panel discussions, authors' talks, films, children's activities, theater, and music;

Whereas the National Museum of American Jewish History is the repository of the largest collection of Jewish Americana in the world, with more than 25,000 objects; and

Whereas the National Museum of American Jewish History is currently building a 100,000-square-foot, 5-story, state-of-the-art museum on Independence Mall, standing just steps from the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall, to serve as a cornerstone of the American Jewish community and a source of national pride: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes—

(1) the importance of the continuing study and preservation of the unique American Jewish experience; and

(2) the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, as the only museum in the Nation dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience and, as such, as the national museum of American Jewish history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution recognizes the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, as the only museum dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience.

I am fortunate to have this outstanding institution in my district. Founded in 1976, the National Museum of American Jewish History currently has the largest collection of Jewish Americana in the world. Even so, it is expanding to a new building on Independence Mall in Philadelphia.

I cannot think of a more appropriate place for this institution than at the heart of our Nation's birth, just steps from Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. I applaud the museum for its dedication to connecting the Jewish community to their heritage and to reminding Americans of all backgrounds of their freedoms and diversity we all enjoy.

I urge Members to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this to the floor.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1381, recognizing the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, as the only museum in the Nation dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience.

This resolution simply commends and congratulates the National Museum of American Jewish History for its outstanding work in presenting and preserving the Jewish American experience and in teaching all Americans about the importance of freedom, respect, and diversity.

Opening on July 4, 1976, the museum holds the largest collection in the world of Jewish Americana and is currently expanding to a beautiful new facility appropriately located on Independence Mall in Philadelphia near Independence Hall, the National Constitution Center, and the Liberty Bell. There it will continue to showcase how

the freedom of America fostered an environment in which Jewish Americans made and continue to make significant contributions to American life.

The National Museum of American Jewish History shares its current site with a Jewish congregation established in the 1740s. This was one of the first organized Jewish congregations in the colonies and was later called the Synagogue of the American Revolution. Indeed, Madam Speaker, our founding documents and the principles upon which our Nation was built reflect our Founding Fathers' adherence to Judeo-Christian values and ethics.

From the 1 million Jews in the United States in 1900, to the 550,000 Jews who served in the U.S. military during World War II, to the Jewish peoples liberated by American forces, to the approximately 6 million Jewish Americans with us today, Jews, Americans, and Jewish Americans have been intertwined in their support for liberty and have been vital to our self-governing and culturally rich Republic.

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't say that this resolution comes at a time when current events have subjected the American Jewish community and Jews around the world to greater concern than they have been subjected to for some time. The statements of madmen who have positions of authority in some countries should have us recall the madman of World War II who said similar things.

The descriptions utilized by those who vent hatred today against those of the Jewish faith and Jewish ethnicity, those words of vitriol and hatred can do nothing but foster uncertainty, fear, confusion, and ultimately can incite violence.

We should recall that a good portion of the world, the free world, stood silently some 65 or 70 years ago when those words were uttered by Adolf Hitler, some saying he is nothing but a madman and Germany is such a distinguished, scientifically advanced, culturally progressive society, that certainly these words of a madman will never take real form. Yet, we know they did.

Today, unfortunately, we hear the words of a madman in the country of Iran. In my judgment, too many people say it doesn't mean much, they are just the rantings of someone without real power and, from a country that has the tremendous history of the Persian culture, they certainly would not act on those statements made by that man. Well, we ought to pay attention to history.

I would advise Members of this Chamber, perhaps, to read George Gilder's excellent work that was published a year and a half ago called "The Israel Test." In there, he talks about the tremendous contribution of Israelis who have come to the United States and become American citizens and also Americans who have gone to Israel and become tremendous citizens of that country, and the continuing relationship between our two countries and our

two cultures, which is to the advantage of both, and the fact that over and over again we have to remind ourselves that those in the State of Israel share common values with the United States and that those common values should not be taken for granted. When they have been taken for granted, they have either been lost or they have been destroyed for some period of time.

So, as we today salute this museum for its historic value, we should remember that museums are, in many ways, invitations to study history so that we might not repeat the terrible mistakes of history but, rather, be inspired by the tremendous advances of history.

So I would like to thank my good friend for offering this resolution. I would urge all my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Pennsylvania, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of House Resolution 1381 and have appreciated working with my colleague, Congressman BRADY, to bring this to the floor.

This resolution recognizes the National Museum of American Jewish history, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, as you have heard, the only museum in the Nation dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience.

As the museum completes its new, expanded facility on Philadelphia's Independence Mall, the museum will have a greater capacity to inspire people of all backgrounds with a deep appreciation for the diversity of the American Jewish experience and, more broadly, the freedoms and the opportunities to which all Americans aspire.

Freedom, liberty, and the opportunity to thrive in America is the museum's overarching theme that will be a powerful experience for people of all ethnic and racial backgrounds. The new facility will be better able to tell the American immigrant story of the individuals meeting challenges and embracing and often fulfilling the American values of self-determination, equality, and opportunity.

□ 1230

The museum highlights the great contributions of Jewish Americans that were made over the history of our Nation to the sciences, public service, and the arts. I encourage all of my colleagues to visit this remarkable institution when it opens its new building on November 14, 2010.

For me, the experience of the National American Jewish History Museum is marked by the remarkable yet familiar story of one immigrant to America. Over 60 years ago, a young woman named Renee Perl was forced to flee Austria to escape the Holocaust.

She arrived alone on the shores of America as a 16-year-old without family or friends. She arrived after years of fear and uncertainty, deeply grateful for the security that America offered and hopeful about her future. Renee Perl was my mother. She instilled in me a deep love for this country and its capacity to provide not only a safe harbor, but also freedom and opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the gentleman.

Her story and her life are a constant reminder to me of the importance of our democracy and our shared responsibility to meet the goals and ideals of our Nation. The National Jewish American History Museum in its new location honors and elaborates on the stories of Jewish Americans like my mother, both ordinary and extraordinary, which make up the fabric of who we are as Americans. I am proud to honor the occasion of the opening of this new facility and look forward to the role the museum will play in telling a part, and for me a very personal part, of our Nation's history.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I would just say again that I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I hope there is a unanimous vote for it, and I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge the passage of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1381.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO ENSURE THAT CBO COST ESTIMATES ARE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1178) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to compile the cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office which are included in reports filed by committees of the House on approved legislation and post such estimates on the official public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1178

Resolved,

SECTION 1. INTERNET POSTING OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATES.

(a) INTERNET POSTING.—The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall ensure that cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office are available to the public by including a link to the official web site of the Congressional Budget Office on the official public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Clerk shall carry out this resolution in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the measure now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The American people are increasingly interested in the nuts and bolts of the legislative process. Americans are especially interested in the Congressional Budget Office's estimates of how pending legislation may increase or decrease the budget deficit.

Under House rules, CBO cost estimates are included in committee reports which are printed once filed with the Clerk and later made available online, but the cost estimates in committee reports are not particularly easy to find online within those committee reports, even if one knows where to look. The gentleman's resolution will make it easier to find cost estimates by having the Clerk link her Web site directly to the CBO public site. This excellent proposal will make CBO spending-related information more widely available than it is now. I have consulted with the Clerk's office, which supports the idea and has assured me the cost will be minimal.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 1178, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to ensure that cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office are available to the public. Shouldn't we be spending our time perhaps having the Budget Committee meet and giving us a budget this year? I mean, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, whom I hold in

tremendous regard, said a number of years ago when the Republicans were in charge, If you can't set a budget, you can't govern. So instead of us giving meat, we're giving what? I don't know what you would call this? It's not even broth.

While I approve of measures that will help the American people know where their money is being spent, that really is the definition of a budget: a budget is the blueprint. In the mid-1970s, we passed the Budget and Impoundment Act for the purpose, purportedly, of making sure that Congress was required to come up with a blueprint that would guide it. Now, it's supposed to be a concurrent resolution, meaning that both Houses pass it. It doesn't go to the President for a signature, so it's an internal document to this institution, that is, the Congress of the United States. And its purpose is to set out markers that will establish the guidelines for spending for the year.

That's one of the reasons we have a Rules Committee that would be required to give a waiver on a budget if an appropriations bill came here in violation of the budget. Well, we're not going to have that this year because we're not going to have a budget. Maybe what we're going to do is we're going to deem things. Remember that from the health care bill: we're going to deem it passed. And when the American people heard about that, they said, well, you can't do that. And finally the majority fell off on that one. But I suppose that's what we're going to do when we bring appropriation bills to the floor. They're going to be deemed to meet the budget that doesn't exist. So instead of us giving us meat like that, we're going to bring up this bill.

What does it do? What does it do? It requires the Clerk of the House to have on her Web site a link to the CBO analysis. Well, that would be important if they weren't available already, but they're available both through Thomas.gov and the CBO Web site. So I thought maybe it's because the Clerk has some responsibility over the Congressional Budget Office, but that's not the case. If you look at all of the obligations that the Clerk of the House has, they have absolutely nothing to do with the Congressional Budget Office.

So what are we doing here? We're bringing a bill to the floor which pretends, it seems to me, to do something about the budget; and it's nothing more than a distraction. The fact of the matter is we do not have a budget this year; we will not have a budget this year. The majority has said they don't want to bring a budget forward. Now, certain news reports have suggested the reason why we will not have a budget is that it will be too embarrassing for us to bring a budget to the floor, particularly before an election. Now, I don't know whether that's true or not, but that has been cited in the public press.

We've been hearing a lot lately from our friends on the other side about the

importance of disclosure. Section 301 of their highly touted DISCLOSE Act requires reporting organizations to post a link from their home page to the page where its financial disclosure information is available; yet in this bill there is no requirement for a CBO link for the House's home page or for the Members' home page or from the committee's home page or for Members who voted for the spending that will impact the budget, but just from the Clerk's. I really don't understand what this is really going to do.

It is telling, while the majority attempts to pass measures like this, we're doing nothing to actually take less of the hard-earned tax dollars of the American people. I was home for the last 10 days in my district, or at least preceding yesterday, and I didn't hear a single person beg me to put a link on the Clerk's Web site for this information. They demanded that we do something about the budget. And when I told them at home we're doing nothing about the budget because the majority has decided we're not even going to bring a budget up—this will be the first time since we passed that law in the seventies that the House has not passed a budget. Now I hear them say, When the Republicans were in charge we didn't have a budget. That is true. Sometimes the Senate and the House weren't able to reconcile it, but we always passed a budget document from the House of Representatives.

So we will be making history this year: no budget for the American people. But they can get on a link and they can go to CBO and they can find out what it costs for a particular bill, but they can't tell whether it's in the budget or not because we don't have a budget. We don't even have to have budget waivers this year from the Rules Committee because there's nothing to waive. Where are the points of order against excessive spending? That's what this House is built on, rules that are supposed to protect the taxpayer. We now are exempting ourselves from our own rules.

When I go home, people say, Why doesn't Congress work under the same rules that the rest of the world works under? And I have to agree with them. Now, when I go back to my district and I talk to folks, they talk about the budget for their household. I met with a number of small business people, all the way from a small community in my district called Copperopolis, which celebrated its 150th anniversary, to Folsom, where we celebrated the 150th reenactment of the Pony Express—actually, they may have the Pony Express there, they also have Intel there—down to Citrus Heights in my district, talking to people all the time, and they kept saying, Why are you taxing so much? Why are you spending so much? Why are you busting the budget? Why are you putting all of this heavy debt burden on our kids? And I said, Those are the same questions I'm asking. When I go back, I'll ask them

again. So I'm asking right here, Why are we doing it? And instead of us getting serious, we're going to have this: give you a link to the Clerk's office so that somehow you can find the estimate that's already available on two other Web sites.

Now, what are we doing? Have we run out of post offices to name? We have rid the world of the scourge of unnamed post offices in this Congress, and now maybe we're going to start going link by link by link by link. I've been in this Congress for a number of years. I didn't realize it took us to pass a resolution to allow the Clerk to do this. Maybe that's something we have to do from now on.

Madam Speaker, instead of wasting the time of this House, maybe we should actually lower the cost estimates produced by the CBO. That would be a good thing; we'll actually take an effort to try and lower them. But the first way you do that is adopt a budget where you debate it and we come to the floor and we say this is what we can afford and this is what we can't afford. We're not even doing that.

It would be irresponsible for any family in my district to not have a budget. It would be irresponsible for any business in my district to not have a budget. It would be irresponsible for any local government in my district to not have a budget, yet we don't have a budget. So instead of dealing with that, we are here dealing with this bill.

I don't question the gentleman's sincerity in offering this bill. I don't suggest he doesn't want more transparency. But, frankly, transparency over a system that doesn't have the essential foundation of a budget is really a wisp in the wind.

Madam Speaker, I reluctantly oppose this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Thank you, Mr. BRADY, for yielding.

I rise today in support of my resolution, House Resolution 1178, requiring the Clerk of the House to make available Congressional Budget Office cost estimates for each bill considered by the House by including a link to the official CBO Web site on the Clerk's official Web site.

For every bill that comes to the House floor from committee, there is included a cost estimate or a score. This estimate is included with the conference report. We here in the House all know this and we use these scores to make informed decisions about our votes every day. But the CBO score can be difficult to find for my constituents. I've had many complaints about this from people in my district looking to find out what we are spending our money on here.

The Clerk's office keeps the official records of the bills that we are working

on; and by including this link, it will be much easier for constituents all over the country to get access to this important spending information and how these bills that we're working on will affect the bottom line of government finance.

□ 1245

The CBO score lets us know how this legislation will affect our long-term fiscal solvency and whether it will increase our debt. Obviously, as we live in this time of very great debt, it is something that is very important to my constituents. Making sure that our constituents have the information they need to see how legislation will affect them and their families is not only good policy but good government. By promoting openness and transparency in everything we do here in Congress, we can begin to restore the public's trust in this body.

For me, openness and transparency are things I've been working on since I got here just a year ago, and there are many opportunities for us in Congress to do this and to dialogue more effectively with our constituents so they know what we are doing here in Washington. For me, that includes posting my schedule online so that people can find out what I'm doing every day on their behalf. It includes posting appropriations requests online so that people can see for what money I am asking for my district. This is the kind of transparency that people tell me every day they want to see, and this resolution will do that with respect to CBO scores and making them available about the legislation we are considering here.

This legislation is only one piece of the equation in increasing openness and transparency in Congress, but it is a critical component to ensure that our constituents have the information they need to accurately judge our actions here in Congress and to ensure that we continue to uphold the standards of our office. Beyond reforms like this, it is our responsibility as Representatives to do our own part to promote openness and transparency. It is the only way that we can restore faith in this broken system.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman BRADY and Ranking Member LUNGREN for their support in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman said. However, the CBO scores are already linked for the public to view through Thomas.gov as well as a large number of other House, Senate, and other private Web sites.

To find out how many, we went and we did a Google search. It reveals over 1,180 Web sites which link to the CBO home page. 1,180 Web sites are already linked to the CBO home page. In addition, the estimates are already publicly available on the CBO Web site, so adding a link there from the Clerk's Web

page doesn't make it any more available than it already is.

Again, I would just say this: When I was home, not a single person said the way to solve the problem is to put a link on the Clerk's Web site to the CBO estimates that are already available on 1,180 Web sites. What people back home said is, Get a grip on reality. Stop spending too much. Stop taxing too much. Stop putting us into debt—and for God's sake, can't you at least spend time coming up with a budget?

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I want to thank my colleague from California for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I guess the question I would have is: Is there anything in our rules that would prohibit the Clerk from just doing this without legislation, without a resolution? Has anybody just asked the Clerk to do this?

Do you know?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman would yield, frankly, I don't know. That has not been presented to us at all.

Mr. WALDEN. It would seem to me that the Clerk works for the House, and if the majority party just wanted to ask the Clerk to put a link on the Web site, it should be able to be done. It shouldn't be a problem.

Besides that, I want to get to the real issue here, which is: Where is the budget?

You know, taxpayers every April 15 are required by law to file their taxes, and this Congress is supposed to come up with a budget. If you go back to 1974, which is when the Budget and Impoundment Control Act was passed, every year, the House has had at least a vote on a budget—not always on time, but at least you've always had a vote. We don't even have a budget. So we're spending time here arguing about whether the Clerk should link to the CBO site when we ought to be having a real debate on America's future and on a budget.

When I was home over this break, I talked to a lot of Oregonians who are fearful and angry about the runaway deficit spending. They understand the implications on their kids and on their grandkids. They don't believe Washington is listening, and I think this is an example of that. We're having a debate on something which, I think, the Clerk could probably do of her own volition. Certainly, the Speaker could ask her to, and I don't think anybody would object. It just doesn't make sense to me. So you don't have an appropriations bill moving. You don't have a budget coming. We can name post offices and we can honor sports teams, but we can't address the very problem that is costing us jobs in America.

I was a small business owner for nearly 22 years. The pressure from this government on the back of small business is killing jobs, and it is keeping people away from creating jobs. The

high taxes, the high regulations, the uncertainty in the marketplace are costing the economy and jobs.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman has no more speakers, I will yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, again, the point is that there are 1,180 Web sites already linking to the CBO. If anything would add to the frustration of the American people, it would be in response to their complaint that we are spending too much, taxing too much, putting them in too much debt, and we don't even have a budget, but we're going to give them a link. Maybe Patrick Henry said, "Give me a link or give me death," or something like that. I don't know.

All I'm saying is we almost make ourselves silly here. I know that's not the intent of the gentleman, and I wouldn't suggest so, but back home, this would be considered laughable.

With that, I would ask for a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I heard that what we have to do is ask the Clerk.

Why are we doing this? We make laws. We are making a law here now. We are telling the Clerk. We are not only telling this Clerk. We are telling any Clerk that we want to put a Web site on the Clerk's page for our constituents to see.

Then I hear that we're spending time arguing. We're not spending time arguing. You're spending time arguing over something that doesn't pertain to this bill. We're not spending time arguing. We would have gotten done in 5 minutes, but because you wouldn't let me speak and because you're allowed to, you're arguing, not us.

So, with that, I thank the gentleman from New York for his great contribution to transparency. Transparency, transparency, transparency. When we go a little step further, we get a rebuttal. I thank the gentleman for his sunshine—for making people see easily without looking through all of the other Web sites, rather just on the Web site of the Clerk of the House, and we're getting that. So I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution to transparency and to sunshine in government.

I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks in debate to the Chair and not in the second person.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1178, which directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to compile the cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office which are included in reports filed by committees of the House on approved legislation and post such estimates on the official public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1178, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN WOODEN

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1427) honoring the life of John Robert Wooden.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1427

Whereas John Robert Wooden was born on October 14, 1910, in Hall, Indiana;

Whereas John Wooden began his basketball career at Martinsville High School and helped his team win the Indiana State high school basketball title in 1927;

Whereas John Wooden later became a three-time all-American star guard at Purdue University, helped lead Purdue to the National Championship in 1932, was named the 1932 national collegiate player of the year, and received the Big Ten medal for excellence in scholarship;

Whereas John Wooden served honorably as a lieutenant in the United States Navy during World War II;

Whereas John Wooden began his collegiate coaching career in 1946 at Indiana State Teachers College (now Indiana State University), where he fought racial inequality by refusing an invitation to the 1947 National Association of Intercollegiate Basketball because an African-American player on his team would not be allowed to participate;

Whereas John Wooden became head coach at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) in 1948 and quickly established a record of success with his student-athletes both on and off the court that is legendary and unmatched;

Whereas John Wooden led the UCLA Bruins to 10 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) championships (including 7 in a row), 19 conference championships, 12 final four appearances, four perfect seasons, and a record 88-game winning streak from 1971 to 1974;

Whereas John Wooden was the first person elected to the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame as both a player and as a coach;

Whereas John Wooden was foremost an educator who always stressed the importance of team play while inspiring the development of individual talent and academic excellence;

Whereas John Wooden was the personification of teamwork and good sportsmanship, and his name is synonymous with integrity;

Whereas an annual award in John Wooden's name is given to the Nation's top

college men's and women's basketball player;

Whereas John Wooden won the lifelong respect of his colleagues, players, and fans for the values he lived and espoused;

Whereas John Wooden's renowned Wooden Pyramid of Success, which stresses industriousness, friendship, loyalty, cooperation, enthusiasm, self-control, alertness, initiative, intentness, condition, skill, team spirit, poise, and confidence as the building blocks for competitive greatness, is one of the most widely recognized blueprints for excellence in any pursuit;

Whereas, on July 23, 2003, John Wooden received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor recognizing exceptional meritorious service;

Whereas, on December 20, 2003, the basketball floor at UCLA's Pauley Pavilion was dedicated as "Nell and John Wooden Court"; and

Whereas John Wooden, whose death was preceded by his beloved wife Nell, is survived by his 2 children, Nancy and James, 7 grandchildren, and 13 great-grandchildren: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors John Wooden for his exceptional career as a coach, player, educator, and mentor, including his unrivaled achievements during his tenure at UCLA;

(2) pays tribute to his iconic legacy of leadership, and recognizes the respect and admiration he earned through his dedication to the betterment of others; and

(3) expresses condolences on his passing to his children, Nancy and James, his grandchildren, his great-grandchildren, and the countless players, fans, and admirers who mourn his passing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1427 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1427, honoring the life of John Robert Wooden.

John Wooden loved basketball. As a young man in Martinsville, Indiana, starting on his high school basketball team in 1927, Wooden led his team to an Indiana State high school basketball title, marking the beginning of a basketball career brimming with great success. In college, at Purdue University, his athletic victories continued, winning All-American honors 3 years in a row, as well as a spot in the Basketball Hall of Fame. The great success on the basketball court Wooden achieved while in school set the foundation for the great athletic accomplishments he would later go on to achieve.

After being offered a spot in the NBA, Wooden turned it down, deciding

rather to teach high school English and to coach high school basketball. His only break from the school setting was during World War II, when he served honorably as a lieutenant in the United States Navy.

In 1948, Wooden accepted an offer to coach the University of California team in Los Angeles, the UCLA Bruins basketball team, and he quickly established a record of success with his student athletes both on and off the court. In his first year with the team, he led the Bruins through a near perfect season, winning 22 out of 29 games. Wooden guided the team to 10 National Collegiate Athletic Association championships, seven of which were in a row. In addition, he led the Bruins to 19 conference championships, 12 Final Four appearances, four perfect seasons, and a record 88-game winning streak from 1971 to 1974.

Off the court, John Wooden was admired and respected as much as he was on the court. Foremost an educator, Wooden stressed the importance of team play while inspiring the development of individual talent and academic excellence. The distinguished Wooden Pyramid of Success has been widely recognized as an example for the building blocks to competitiveness and excellence in any quest, not just sports. It emphasizes the skills that Wooden taught, such as friendship, loyalty, cooperation, enthusiasm, self-control, team spirit, poise, and self-confidence. In 2003, he was presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest honor given to a civilian.

John Wooden lost the love of his life, Nell Wooden, but he is survived by his two children, by his seven grandchildren, and by his 13 great-grandchildren, as well as by the millions of basketball fans who believe there will never be another coach like John Wooden in any sport, and they mourn his passing.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Representative WAXMAN for bringing this bill forward.

I wish to honor the legendary Coach Wooden for his immense contributions, not only to the game of basketball, but also for his exceptional career as an educator, as a mentor, and for his dedication to the betterment of others. John Wooden's lasting legacy is carried on today on basketball courts all around the country as he was loved and admired by all who play and who know the game. I wish to express my deep condolences to his family, to his friends, to his former players, and to his countless fans and admirers.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1427, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to be here today, as I am a huge college basketball fan, to rise in support of House Resolution 1427, honoring Coach John Robert Wooden.

Today, we honor Coach Wooden's accomplishments and leadership. Coach

Wooden was born in Hall, Indiana, and he attended Purdue University, where he played on the university's basketball team and where he was the first player to be named a three-time All-American. Coach Wooden also played professionally for the team that later became the Indianapolis Jets. In 1961, he was enshrined in the Basketball Hall of Fame for his accomplishments as a player.

Coach Wooden began his teaching career at Dayton High School in Kentucky. After his service in World War II, Coach Wooden began coaching at Indiana Teachers College, now Indiana State University. In 1984, Wooden was inducted into the Indiana State University Athletic Hall of Fame. In 1948, Coach Wooden began his coaching career at UCLA. In 1 year, Coach Wooden turned the 12-13 losing team to a 22-7 winning team. John Wooden retired from UCLA and from coaching in 1975, but he left a legacy in his wake.

Coach Wooden's list of accomplishments is long and impressive. He led the UCLA men's basketball team to 10 NCAA Men's Basketball Championships, seven in consecutive years. He made the most appearances in the Final Four, the most consecutive appearances and the most victories in the Final Four. He set the record for the most consecutive wins at 88 games—amazing—and won 38 straight victories in the NCAA tournament play. He also led UCLA to eight perfect Pac-8—now Pac-10—conference season championships.

Coach John Wooden's accomplishments on the court are innumerable. Today, we honor him for his accomplishments, and it is a great privilege to be here to honor this great man. Coach Wooden was much more than a coach, for his accomplishments were much greater as a person. Coach Wooden will be much missed by his friends, by his family, by the universities in which he served, also by the numerous players, assistant coaches, ball boys, trainers, and others. Coach Wooden's life was about others and not about himself, and I think, when the good Lord sees Coach Wooden, he is going to ask him how in the world he pulled off those 88 straight wins.

I know one of the things I would like to do with my life is to leave it a little bit better than I found it, and I certainly know that Coach John Wooden left it much better than he found it. I, too, as a fan, will miss Coach—a job well done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to honor the remarkable life and tremendous contributions of John Wooden, who passed away in Los Angeles last Friday.

I want to begin by expressing my condolences on his passing to his family and the countless people whose lives he touched.

John Wooden coached at UCLA when I was there earning my undergraduate and law school degrees. I was in my last year of law school when the Bruins had their first perfect season under Coach Wooden, a season that culminated in a championship win over Duke. Everybody on campus was thrilled. No one could have possibly imagined that this was only the beginning of a historic run that will probably never be matched.

John Wooden would go on to coach the Bruins to an unprecedented 10 NCAA championships, including an incredible seven in a row, and a record four perfect seasons, which includes an 88-game win strike, from 1971 to 1974.

The full list of records broken and accolades earned is far too long to cover here. His accomplishments have made his name synonymous with "success," and it is unlikely that anyone will ever be able to match the accomplishments that he has achieved.

Incredibly, his coaching success was never the most remarkable thing about him. What was the most remarkable was how he inspired people and motivated them to excel, on the court and off.

As soon as a game started, it was clear that he wasn't your typical coach. Absent were the outbursts of cursing so typical from other coaches. Instead, Coach Wooden led with the calmness and poise of someone who knew he had prepared his players for anything they could face.

Basketball was just a means for Coach Wooden to influence his players by instilling life lessons and the value of character. He relished the practice and the preparation far more than the games that brought him glory because they provided him the opportunity to teach. Hundreds of UCLA players attribute so much of the success in their lives to the years they spent with John Wooden. And he was most proud about that.

While Coach Wooden could never be replaced, he will be remembered and celebrated for all time because of his love of the game, his love for his players, and his love for his family.

John Wooden often said, "You can't live a perfect day until you do something for someone who will never be able to repay you." Madam Speaker, Coach Wooden lived a lot of perfect days.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the honorable gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Likewise, I rise to honor and pay respects to the life and career of the distinguished Hoosier, Coach John Wooden.

He was born October 14, 1910, in the small town of Hall, Indiana. Coach Wooden was raised on a family farm that had neither running water nor

electricity, and money was often in short supply. He played basketball with his brothers in a barn using a tomato basket and a makeshift ball consisting of old rags. Later in life, he would credit his success to the hard work and discipline he learned growing up on the small family farm.

At the age of 14, his family moved to the town of Martinsville, Indiana, where he led the local high school basketball team for 3 consecutive years, winning the State championship in 1927. For his efforts, he was selected three-time All-State.

After graduating high school in 1928, John Wooden attended Purdue University, where he helped the Boilermakers as team captain to the 1932 national championship. He was named All-Big Ten, All-Midwestern conference while at Purdue. He also was the first player ever to be named three-time consensus All-American guard.

His nickname was the "Indiana Rubber Man" for his hard play on the basketball court.

When John Wooden graduated from Purdue in 1932, he began not only then as a professional basketball player, but then he sought teaching and coaching by accepting a job as an athletic director, a basketball coach, and English teacher at Dayton High School in Dayton, Kentucky. The first year at Dayton was Coach Wooden's only losing season as a high school coach.

In 1934, Wooden and his wife, Nellie, then moved to South Bend, Indiana, where he accepted another coaching and teaching position at South Bend Central High School. Overall, in 11 years of coaching high school, his record was an incredible 218 wins and only 42 losses.

In 1942, the United States entered World War II, and, like many others of his generation, Coach Wooden answered the call to serve his country, serving as a lieutenant in the Navy as a physical education instructor.

After completing his military service, John Wooden quickly found work at what is now known as Indiana State University. He coached basketball at the school and resumed his string of winning seasons.

In 1948, Coach Wooden then moved to UCLA that offered him the head coaching position. And the rest is history, as described by Mr. WAXMAN.

Coach Wooden will be remembered as an exceptional basketball player, an inspiring coach, and a mentor to many, many people. According to Bill Walton, UCLA's three-time All-American center during the 1970s, "He taught us how to focus on one primary objective: Be the best in whatever endeavor you undertake. Don't worry about the score. Don't worry about the image. Don't worry about the opponent. It sounds easy, but it's actually very difficult."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BUYER. "It sounds easy, but it's actually very difficult. Coach Wooden

showed us how to accomplish it," end quote.

Today, the highest award in college basketball is named the Wooden Award, which honors the Nation's best player in both men's and women's college basketball.

John Wooden coached, taught, and lived with honor. He was a very special human being. And this is a Hoosier of which many of us are distinguishedly proud about. I know, California, you also love to claim him. I think all of America can claim him. He is a distinguished gentleman.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. And I have to say that, with the exception of the two floor managers here, we have a Hoosier, Mr. BUYER, and of course two UCLA graduates, Mr. WAXMAN, who's already spoken, and Mr. LEWIS, who is going to follow.

As we take this time to very appropriately remember an amazing life, someone who—as was pointed out when Mr. BUYER mentioned his birth date, October would have marked his 100th birthday. So Coach Wooden lived virtually an entire century.

And I was struck with the quote that Mr. WAXMAN reminded us of, that you've never lived a perfect day until you've done something for someone that cannot repay you. And Coach Wooden is an individual who had a humility but a great inner strength.

And one of the things that was very apparent as you watched him coach and as you saw him involve himself with students and with so many others in the community, there was that gentleness and strength of character that did belie that resolve that he had. But, at the same time, he's someone who was able to be a real winner.

And I think it was pointed out very appropriately right after his passing when Bill Walton and Kareem Abdul Jabbar stood on the floor of the court for the team that in the not-too-distant future is going to become the NBA champion, the Los Angeles Lakers, and remembered the life of Coach Wooden.

And so I want to join with my colleagues in extending our thoughts and prayers to the family members and to all of the students who were able to benefit from the amazing life of Coach John Wooden.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the honorable gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I too rise today to express my deep appreciation for the life and work

of John Wooden, the great coach from UCLA.

The resolution, by the way, that we are discussing today was originally introduced by my colleague HENRY WAXMAN, who spoke a while ago. HENRY's district includes UCLA within its territory. And HENRY and I have worked together for many, many years and have had in common the fact that we are both, kind of, red-hot graduates of UCLA.

We don't agree upon everything. In fact, some would suggest we almost never agree. The reality is, though, that HENRY and I have worked together for many, many years, and I'm very proud of the fact that he's a close friend.

Beyond that, let me say that the House might be interested to know that HENRY and I are such fans of UCLA that he actually allowed me to name my dog Bruin. And Bruin walks to work with me every day, and, in fact, he's over in my office watching this on the floor and will be most intrigued by the fact that people finally are recognizing John and Nell Wooden for the wonderful, wonderful contribution they've made to our country.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I will close by saying that this country has been much better for the presence of John Wooden here and the role model that he's applied for so many young people. And I would suggest that you go out and read his book, or books.

And one of the quotes, and I'm paraphrasing this, that struck me that he has said—I think his players would say Woodenisms—but it is: "It's much more important what kind of individual you are than what kind of athlete you were." And I think we all need to keep that in mind as we go forward in our day.

And I appreciate the opportunity to be able to honor Coach Wooden today, one of my heroes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I would also like to point out I have a basketball player in my home, and I certainly had the biography because the man that we're talking about, the great hero, John Robert Wooden, did indeed show Americans how to play a sport and how to play it honorably and how to play on and off the court.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of John Wooden who became an angel at age 99 on June 4, 2010. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this difficult time.

I appreciate the efforts of my colleague, fellow UCLA graduate, and friend HENRY WAXMAN who authored this resolution honoring Coach Wooden. While HENRY and I haven't always agreed on policy issues, I have long valued his friendship and our shared love of all things UCLA. For those who do not know just

how strongly I feel about my alma mater . . . my dog happens to be named Bruin.

It is a humbling moment to rise on behalf of thousands of UCLA alumni who are proud not just to graduate from a great university but to be associated with John Wooden, the pre-eminent basketball coach for all time.

From 1964 to 1975, his Bruin teams won 10 national championships, including seven in a row. No other men's basketball coach has won more than four. He led UCLA to four perfect seasons. No other coach has had more than one undefeated season. Wooden's teams won with legendary players known the world over and were victorious with players whose names are remembered only by the UCLA faithful.

But Coach Wooden was so much more than statistics, championships, and career honors. He was a reminder of values both endearing and enduring during a time of great social and political upheaval. Bruins and basketball lovers could disagree over the headlines in the newspapers but could unite around the humble leadership of Coach Wooden.

It is his role as an educator where he has made his greatest mark. Wooden developed the "Pyramid of Success" a simple, yet profound, representation of the ideals that form the basis of Wooden's outlook on life and explain much of his success on and off the court. Emphasizing such traits as skill, poise, and confidence, the Pyramid of Success has helped millions be their best when their best was needed.

Wooden's maxims benefit us all. Be quick, but don't hurry. It's not how tall you are, but how tall you play. Character is what you really are; reputation is what you are perceived to be.

Wooden's supreme devotion was to his family. He married his beloved Nell, the only woman he ever dated, and wrote her love letters every month on the anniversary of her passing. When UCLA's basketball court at Pauley Pavilion was recently renamed in their honor Wooden insisted her name came first. He and his wife symbolized the very best of family life.

Coach Wooden often said "make each day your masterpiece." While he had many days that were masterpieces, the 99 years John Wooden graced us with his presence were his magnum opus.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1427 which honors the life of John Wooden, the legendary basketball coach of the UCLA Bruins, who died this past Sunday, June 6, at the age of 99.

Coach Wooden's success as a college basketball head coach is unparalleled. But his on-court success was matched by the positive impact that he had on the lives of his players. Coach Wooden was the very embodiment of what a coach should be. He was a teacher, a mentor, and a friend. As an alumnus of UCLA and a former college basketball player, I am inspired and awed by Coach Wooden's legacy and proud of his contributions to the game of basketball.

Born in 1910 in Hall, Indiana, John Wooden began his basketball career at Martinsville High School, where he helped lead his team to a state championship. He went on to star at Purdue University, where he was a three-time All-American and the 1932 national collegiate player of the year. He is the first and only person inducted into the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame as both a player and a coach.

But John Wooden's remarkable success as a player is often overlooked because of the historic achievements of his coaching career. John Wooden began his coaching career at UCLA in 1948 and immediately established a record of success that has made him an American icon and the gold standard of college basketball coaches. Coach Wooden led the UCLA Bruins to 10 national championships, a record no other coach in college basketball history has come close to matching. Between 1967 and 1973, Coach Wooden's Bruins won an incredible 7 consecutive national championships. No other coach has more than three. In addition, he led the Bruins to 19 conference championships, 12 Final Four appearances, 4 perfect seasons, and a remarkable 88 game winning streak, which remains the longest in history. The record 38 game NCAA tournament winning streak that his Bruins compiled in winning the first 9 national championships is surely as close to unbeatable a record as any in all of sports. The next longest winning streak is a mere 14 games, compiled by the Duke Blue Devils from 1992–94.

As a former college basketball player, I understand the long hours of hard work and intense dedication needed to achieve a single winning season. So, the monumental record of success compiled by Coach Wooden is staggering. But, as Coach Wooden would be the first to explain, his monumental achievements were the product of an intense focus on the details. Coach Wooden was famous for starting the first day of practice each season with a tutorial on how to properly put on athletic socks in order to avoid blisters. It was this outlook on the game—this understanding that attention to detail is a fundamental first step to achieving great things—that made Coach Wooden such a master.

John Wooden's success on the court was topped only by the positive effect that he had on the lives of his players. All of Coach Wooden's players will attest that, while he surely made them better basketball players, his most lasting impact on their lives was his ability to make them better people. Coach Wooden was an educator and a mentor in the truest sense. More than personal talent, he stressed the importance of loyalty, companionship, cooperation, and enthusiasm. He imparted upon his players lessons that led to life-long success.

The words of wisdom he imparted to the players he coached helped them become champions on and off the court. Who can forget these famous quotes of Coach Wooden:

"Don't confuse activity with achievement."

"Be quick but don't hurry."

"Failing to prepare is preparing to fail."

"It's what you learn after you know it all that counts."

"The main ingredient of stardom is the rest of the team."

"Things turn out best for the people who make the best of the way things turn out."

"Failure is not fatal, but failure to change might be."

"Talent is God given. Be humble. Fame is man-given. Be grateful. Conceit is self-given. Be careful."

For his contributions to the game of basketball and to the lives of so many young Americans, Coach Wooden was deservedly awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Coach Wooden is an American icon who will be

missed dearly, but whose legacy will continue to shine in the sports world and throughout American life.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1427.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5072, FHA REFORM ACT OF 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1424 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1424

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5072) to improve the financial safety and soundness of the FHA mortgage insurance program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such

amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of June 11, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1424.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The rule provides for consideration of House bill 5072, the FHA Reform Act of 2010. It is a structured rule which makes in order 13 amendments. The rule waives all points of order against the bill except those arising under clause 9 and 10 of rule XXI. It further considers the amendment in the nature of a substitute from the Financial Services Committee be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides authority to the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules on Thursday and Friday of this week.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5072, the Federal Housing Administration Reform Act of 2010, provides FHA with the necessary tools to strengthen its mortgage insurance program and overall financial position. The collapse of the private sector in the wake of the financial crisis left a large void in the housing market. Banks didn't have the capital to lend, so potential home buyers were left out in the cold. FHA played a critical role in filling this void, providing a much-needed catalyst to the real estate industry, which was left reeling from the subprime debacle. This preserved hundreds of thousands of jobs in the real estate industry.

As a result of taking on a more prominent role, FHA's market share increased from about 4 percent to now more than 30 percent of total purchases, 88 percent of which are first-time home buyers.

This bill makes several necessary reforms which will make it more efficient and accountable. First, it provides FHA with the authority to raise the annual mortgage premium for new borrowers. It also provides FHA with enhanced authority when FHA finds evidence of fraud or noncompliance by a mortgagee. If a lender or underwriter is found to be violating FHA regulations when underwriting loans by making risky loans or cutting corners, the FHA can terminate that underwriter or lender's ability to lend under the program. The bill also improves FHA's risk management, and under the bill, the FHA will provide additional data which will give a clearer overview of FHA's fiscal position.

The bill we are considering here today is bipartisan and incorporates many changes sought by the Housing and Urban Development Department, industry stakeholders, and Members of Congress. It passed the Financial Services Committee by a voice vote with little opposition. Most important, the Congressional Budget Office analyzed the bill and estimates it will save \$2.5 billion over the next 5 years.

FHA plays a critical role in the marketplace, and this bill strengthens the program so that it can continue its role in a sound manner. FHA was created during the Great Depression to stimulate the economy, particularly with regard to real estate. This purpose is equally important today, so it is crucial that we make reforms to the program that will allow it to keep up with the industry. This bill will promote responsible lending and reduce the deficit by \$2.5 billion. I look forward to the debate on this bill, which will restore greater confidence in the housing industry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from Colorado, for giving me such time as the Republicans may have, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this will be the 31st time that I have handled a rule on this House floor in this Congress, and this is the 31st time that I have yet to handle an open rule. In fact, out of the over 120 rules of this Congress, we have not debated one open rule. Not one open rule this Congress.

I don't believe that closing debate, limiting amendments, and shutting Democrats and Republicans out of thoughtful ideas is a good way to run this House. And I know and you know, and I say this often, that our Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, promised when she told the American people that she would run the most open, honest, and ethical Congress, I don't think she had this in mind, and I know we didn't as Republicans; and I don't think the American people did, not to have one open rule this Congress.

I know we are getting ready to finish this Congress in a couple months. But one would think that when the Speaker spoke those words, she had something

in mind other than closed rules or some modified rules. Open, honest, ethical. Not one open rule this Congress.

One thing that I do have the opportunity to say today, however, Madam Speaker, is that the call for a vote on the previous question to allow for this week's YouCut winner will be good. YouCut is the new Republican online voting tool for Americans to pick what wasteful government spending they would like to see cut every week and which should be an agenda on this floor every week.

I admire the majority for finally having a bill that saves the taxpayer money. Don't know how many times that's happened in this Congress or under this Speaker. But what I can tell you is hundreds of thousands of Americans this week have been on the YouCut site, and they came up with lots of answers. So I applaud the Democrat majority for coming up with, finally, a bill which will save taxpayers money.

Additionally, today we are here to discuss an important step in providing the Department of Housing and Urban Development, also known as HUD, with the tools it needs to supervise and monitor the single-family mortgage insurance program run through the Federal Housing Administration, known as FHA. That's what we are here for, and I am glad that this bill is here. Saving money and running the government more efficiently, and providing the tools, is what Congress should be for.

It is necessary to understand why these changes are important. And in my opinion, my colleagues, who really work across party lines, need to do more of this kind of work of helping rather than providing more rules and regulations. The continued importance of protecting the taxpayer is primary and important to people who are paying the taxes. They want to know that there should be more work like this being done in Washington.

As the housing market collapsed over the last 2 years, private lenders have scaled back their activities, with the FHA significantly increasing its share of the single-family mortgage market from less than 5 percent to now more than 30 percent. With higher mortgage share comes increased taxpayer exposure. The elevated levels of delinquencies and foreclosures across this Nation have had a detrimental effect on the financial health of the FHA, which is why reforms in this legislation are an essential piece of fixing and addressing this problem today.

I applaud the gentleman, Mr. FRANK, and I applaud the gentlewoman, Mrs. CAPITO, for working together, for essentially bringing a huge part of Mrs. CAPITO's bill to the floor today. The taxpayers have already paid their fair share for bailouts and failed stimulus programs, resulting in record debts and record deficits. It's important to bring some stability and to recognize problems before they happen.

H.R. 5072 incorporates a majority of the provisions from my friend, Ranking

Member SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO's, legislation, H.R. 4811, the FHA Safety and Soundness and Taxpayer Protection Act. This legislation from Representative CAPITO provides additional enforcement, the financial and risk assessment tools necessary to adequately administer the program, to detect fraud and abuse, and to strengthen underwriting standards and, perhaps best of all, to protect the taxpayer.

While the legislation is a step in the right direction, it is important to note that the benefits of using government subsidies to promote homeownership to be more balanced against the potential risk of insuring less creditworthiness with borrowers, and exposing the taxpayer to additional risk, is perhaps the best part of this bill. It is extremely important to have proper underwriting, and to ensure that potential home buyers have the appropriate amount of personal funds invested in the transaction to make sure that the housing market does not collapse again.

Madam Speaker, while this legislation is an important step, Congress should do more to protect the taxpayer from having to suffer the consequences of bailouts in another government housing program.

Congressman SCOTT GARRETT of New Jersey, also on the Financial Services Committee, offered several amendments which were not made in order by the Rules Committee, and so they will not be voted on today on the floor.

□ 1330

These amendments, however, are worthy of speaking about it. They would have protected taxpayers from yet another government bailout as we were setting the rules for the future to say the Federal Government should not be in the bailout business.

My friends on the other side of the aisle once again continued to shut out not just SCOTT GARRETT but taxpayers and people who had ideas, that are called Members of Congress, and not allow a debate on commonsense solutions that save the taxpayer money.

Once again, I applaud the gentleman, Mr. FRANK, for bringing this bill to the floor, but we need more and more discussion about how we limit taxpayer exposure.

I believe that Congress and the administration must be extremely cautious and always vigilant in their oversight of this program and others to make certain that the program is adequately capitalized and is run in a safe and sound manner that protects the taxpayer from the need not only for another bailout but wasteful government spending.

Additionally, as the housing market begins to stabilize, we must begin to look for ways to decrease reliance on the Federal Government guarantees and encourage the reentry of private capital and investment in the mortgage market.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) to discuss his ideas on this bill.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, recently, we found out that the national debt has surpassed \$13 trillion. That means that each American owes approximately \$42,000. I align myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas in applauding the gentleman from Colorado and Massachusetts in bringing this bill to the floor that actually does save taxpayer dollars for the American people. I also want to recognize the leadership of Ms. CAPITO from West Virginia, whose bill this originally was.

Here's an idea, Madam Speaker. Rather than simply talking about how shocking our dangerous level of national debt is, why don't we actually do something about it today. America is at a crossroads, and the choices we make today will determine the kind of country we will be.

The Republican Economic Recovery Working Group launched the YouCut program to change the culture in Washington, and it's clear from news reports, Madam Speaker, that it's starting to do so. We saw the White House just last week ask each government agency to cut 5 percent from their budgets. While we applaud their intentions, House Republicans are offering a way to cut spending—not tomorrow, not next week, but right now—with YouCut.

There is no doubt that our debt situation is reaching a crisis point that demands a united, bipartisan effort to solve it. I'll be the first to raise my hand to say that Republicans have played our part in contributing to the problems in the past. But for those Americans out there struggling to pay their mortgages, does it really matter to them whose fault it was?

I come to the floor today, Madam Speaker, to urge my Democratic colleagues to join us in supporting this week's winning YouCut proposal to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which received 45 percent of the vote on YouCut. SCOTT GARRETT and JEB HENSARLING's proposal would save \$30 billion in taxpayer money over the next decade.

The two government-sponsored enterprises have racked up a taxpayer-funded tab of \$145 billion and counting. According to the Congressional Budget Office, if we don't reform Fannie and Freddie, that price tag will only rise. There's no doubt that reforming Fannie and Freddie will be a challenging task, but taking on this kind of challenge is why our constituents gave us the privilege of serving in this House in the first place.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's support of the underlying bill and the savings of \$2.5 billion and that they'd like to proceed and make some cuts to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac over the course of the next year, and that is something that ultimately we have to address.

Under Mr. FRANK and under this Democratic Congress, we've already

worked on reforms to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, unlike my friends on the Republican side of the aisle. And I just remind them what their chairman of the House Financial Services said about the efforts to reform and revamp Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac back when the Republicans were in charge of both the White House and this Congress.

There was an effort to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac between Mr. Oxley and Mr. FRANK, but instead of getting any assistance, he fumed particularly about the White House. This was from an article in the Financial Times. It was by Mr. Oxley. This is an article written and quoted from Mr. Oxley in the Financial Times last September, September 9, 2008, where he fumes against criticism that the House didn't try to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac back a few years ago. He says, "All the hand-wringing and bed-wetting is going on without remembering how the House stepped up on this," to try to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. He said, "What did we get from the White House?" A White House that was controlled by the Republicans. "We got a one-finger salute" in trying to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Well, unlike under Republican leadership, we've been working on reforming Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and we have been looking for ways to cut costs and expenses of the United States. And one of those places we're already doing something about, which makes their suggestion looks like peanuts, and that's in Iraq.

The Republicans, under the leadership of George Bush and the Republican Congress, cut the taxes for the wealthiest 1 percent, prosecuted two wars without paying for them, left Wall Street in disarray by failing to police Wall Street. And what did we get? We got a financial meltdown and a giant debt, \$1.3 trillion, when Barack Obama took office. And now they're complaining about the costs that they left in place based on their way of running the country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, a couple times ago when I was on the floor and we were doing the rule, we got into this debate about blaming George Bush for everything, and I would simply remind my colleague, as I did that day, I'd pin the tail on the donkey. We know who controls the spending and taxing around here.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the favorite son from Dallas, Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the American people understand that this Nation is facing a debt crisis. Congress, under control of our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, has seen the deficit increase almost tenfold since they took control of Congress. We

know that President Obama has now submitted a budget which will double the national debt in 5 years and triple it in 10 from 2008.

Madam Speaker, I serve on the President's Fiscal Responsibility Commission, and we have recently heard testimony that when a nation's gross debt equals 90 percent of its economy—in this case, GDP—that the needle has hit the red zone, that you can lose economic growth. And, on average, history tells us you can lose 1 percentage point, a full third. The Congressional Budget Office is predicting 3 percent economic growth. It could be 2 percent.

Madam Speaker, the United States' gross debt is now at 89 percent of GDP, and the American people now know it's either you cut or your children may one day face bankruptcy.

Spending is out of control. Our children are facing a future with fewer jobs, shrinking paychecks, smaller homes, an American Dream that is constricted and diminished. We are on the verge of being the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living.

And just this morning on the Budget Committee, Chairman Bernanke said that it is important that the Congress act today on the government-sponsored enterprises; it is important that the Congress act today on enacting a budget; it's important that the government act today to reduce the national debt that has an impact on economic growth and jobs today.

But we have no plan, at least listening to the gentleman from Colorado. If we had a plan to deal with the GSEs, it has not ended in a success that the American people recognize. We're now looking at \$147 billion of taxpayer bailout. Between the government-sponsored enterprises and the FHA, they now control approximately 95 percent of the market. More government control.

And that's why the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. GARRETT, and I have introduced H.R. 4889, the GSE Bailout Elimination and Taxpayer Protection Act, to end this. And, instead, what we have from our other friends from the other side of the aisle is they actually exempt the government-sponsored enterprises who are at the epicenter of the financial crisis from the new legislation.

Again, it is time that we put Fannie and Freddie on a road to market competition to end the perpetual bailouts, to save taxpayers money, because it's either you cut or your children pay for it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, I want to acknowledge the praise given to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), and, I would add, I was thanked, but the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) worked closely with Mrs. CAPITO to bring this bill forward.

Secondly, on the deficit, this Friday morning I will be at a meeting. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and I are beginning an enterprise to pull back the excessive overreach of America militarily. We are spending more money now defending Western Europe from an enemy unknown to anybody—including those in Western Europe—than we're spending on virtually any domestic program. So, yes, I welcome that, and I'll look to see where we are on that.

I support President Obama's efforts to save money in the space program. Frankly, when people tell me that we have got a serious debt crisis but they're willing to commit hundreds of billions of dollars to send a human being to Mars so he or she can be brought back—and the President is not, I think, correct on this—then I am also skeptical.

Some of my friends in the Agricultural Committee and in the South who support sending \$147 million of American tax dollars to the Brazilian cotton farmers to offset the subsidy given to American cotton farmers, I doubt their true depth of their commitment to cutting the budget.

But let me talk about revisionist history.

The Republican Party controlled the Congress from 1995 to 2006. No legislation changing Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac went through. President Bush controlled the executive branch for 2000 to 2008. What he did—he said he wanted some reform. You've heard the former chairman, the former Republican chairman Mr. Oxley, denigrate Mr. Bush's cooperation there. But in 2004, the Bush administration ordered Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to increase the number of mortgages they bought for people below the median income. And at the time I said I thought that was a mistake; wrong for the people who were being pushed into this, wrong for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and, in fact, it led me to change my opinion.

In 2003, I didn't think Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac needed change, but George Bush converted me. He converted me when he sent them much too deeply, by his decision, into more subprime mortgages. I thought it was better to use Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac for affordable rental housing. Once that happened, I joined Mr. Oxley in 2005 in an effort to pass a bill, and I supported a bill that passed in the House.

Now, we're going to hear from some Republican Members today who say nothing was done. You know what their problem was, Madam Speaker? They couldn't get the support of their own Republicans. The Republican leadership of the Financial Services Committee today, the Republican leadership of the House today joined Mr. Oxley to be repudiated and yet it had some amendments.

But let's be very clear. The bill that passed the House in 2005, which I, by

the way, ultimately voted against not because of anything to do with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, because of restrictions that were added by the Rules Committee in the self-executing rule to housing programs through affordable rental housing that would have, for example, kept the Catholic church from participating in that.

But on the substance of the bill you will hear that, well, there were amendments and many of us opposed those amendments. That's true. I opposed some of those amendments. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Oxley, opposed those amendments. The Republican leader today, Mr. BOEHNER, opposed those amendments. The majority of Republicans on the Financial Services Committee today opposed those amendments. No amendment offered in either the committee or on the floor of the House by the handful of Republicans who will be here today blaming the Democrats, when the Republicans controlled the White House and the Republicans controlled the House and the Republicans controlled the Senate, the House passed the bill, and a handful of Republicans opposed it. And no amendment they offered on the floor or in committee got a majority of Republican votes. If no Democrat had voted on that bill, the outcome would have been exactly the same.

In 2007, when the Democrats took the majority, I became the chairman, and for the first time, the Congress did, in that Congress, pass a bill to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It was held up in the Senate, unfortunately. We did it in 2007. But under that bill, Secretary of the Treasury Paulson, acting on behalf of President Bush, put Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac into conservatorship.

So when people say nothing's been done, in fact, the most drastic reform to date in the financial area came when Secretary Paulson, under authority given to him by the Democratic Congress in 2008, put Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac into conservatorship. The debts that are owed are the debts that were incurred during the period when George Bush was President and when the Republicans were unable to enact legislation to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

□ 1345

Now, there was some here who were on the other side. I was unconvinced of the need to do that in 2003. In 2004, when the Bush administration pushed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac more deeply into buying sub-prime mortgages, I opposed that, as I will put in the RECORD, and then joined Mr. Oxley in trying to reform it.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are today in conservatorship. They got up and testified before our committee, unchallenged by any of the Republicans who were tougher in his absence—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. As Secretary Donovan testified, unchallenged by any of the Republicans, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are not now costing the taxpayers any money. The money that is owed is from the prior activity before Secretary Paulson put them into conservatorship with authority that he did not get from a Republican Congress but from a Democratic Congress, and Secretary Paulson said it wasn't a perfect bill but it was a bill that he could work with.

Since then, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have been in conservatorship. They have already been drastically changed, and they are not costing the taxpayer moneys. Clearly, we have to take a next step, but we have consulted with the Realtors, with the home builders, with advocates for low-income housing, with virtually everyone concerned with housing, and their recommendation is, yes, keep them in conservatorship and replace them.

The Republican plan that you have heard, the plan of the minority of Republicans from 2005, abolishes them with no replacement, and so housing finance is left in a turmoil. We have Ginnie Mae, we have the FHA, we have the Federal home loan banks, we have Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Yes, we believe there should be a sorting out of these things, but let's again just summarize.

I have been told that it was my fault that during the Republican years in Congress we didn't pass a bill on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Well, Mr. DeLay of recent memory was in charge of the House agenda then, and I have to disclaim the notion that I was secretly advising Mr. DeLay, and I'll prove that to you, Madam Speaker. If I were giving Mr. DeLay advice, I would have told him not to go on the dance show. It wouldn't have just been Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that would have benefited; a lot would have benefited.

But we were frustrated by him. He was in charge of the housing agenda. A few Republicans wanted to change it. They were outvoted by the Republican majority. When the Democrats took office—and you can read this in Secretary Paulson's book—we cooperated with the Paulson administration. We gave them the authority to put it into conservatorship. They are now both in conservatorship, and we await the next step.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentleman was forthright that he tried to kill the bill that passed the House, went to the Senate and died, the GSE reform bill. The gentleman did say he voted against it, and he did.

I would also remind the gentleman, today is today, and where's the budget? Where's the budget for the House to vote on? Where's the budget? Deafening silence. We should be doing the budget, the budget where the people of the United States find out what the glide path and direction should be for this country for all this spending. Deafening silence, Madam Speaker. Where's

the leadership there? We were talking about a small FHA bill. How about for the United States, all the spending that's going to happen? So, once again, pin the tail on the donkey.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Before I begin, I just have to respond to the chairman's remarks. You know, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask you to listen to what the gentleman from Virginia said before. We're not about at this point in time looking back. We're about looking forward. We're not about looking at pointing blame. I know you have been on the floor for Special Orders speaking for over an hour saying that you're not at fault and you come here again to say that you're not the responsible party, that nothing to do with it as far as the problems with the GSEs, Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac can be laid at your footsteps and it's all the Republicans' fault.

We're not here about trying to point blame to actions that were taken in the committee. We are not here to point blame when you said let's roll the dice and see what happens. We're not here to point blame at you to say that when you said repeatedly in the past that there's not a systemic risk with the GSEs, we're not here to bounce that. We are where the American public is, to look forward to see what we can do now with the crisis that we're in.

I rise today with a message from the American people and that they are simply tired of this pointing blame and they are tired of the hollow promises of reform from Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat majority. They are tired of hearing that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are projected to cost the taxpayers upwards of \$389 billion. So they're probably a little bit shocked when they hear you say that it's not going to cost the American public anything. We know that it will cost upwards, for the past actions, \$389 billion, and going forward who knows exactly what it will cost the American taxpayers.

Since taking over Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the two government-sponsored mortgage-backing companies, American taxpayers have spent so far \$145 billion for these two companies, and here's the important point. This is what we're trying to make here is that Congress still has not considered any proposals whatsoever to reform these companies and recoup those taxpayer dollars. We're about to go into conference, and there is nothing in the Senate or the House bills that deal with that situation.

We, on the other hand, in this YouCut proposal that's on the floor right now, would suggest that we can save the American taxpayers how much money? Up to \$30 billion. Look, I know that originally Congress put a cap of \$200 billion on it, and then the administration lifted that cap and raised it up to \$400 billion that it could

cost the taxpayers, and then in the dead of night on Christmas Eve 2009, they lifted that cap and went even further and said it's unlimited over the next 3 years what it will cost the American taxpayers to bail out Fannie and Freddie. I know that the administration did all that. I also know that it's nowhere projected or listed really honestly in the budget that we're still waiting to hear, as the gentleman from Texas just pointed out.

We know also that, as we say, there is no plan from the majority or from this administration to try to rein that in to save these \$30 billion, and that is why we come to the floor to do just that because the American taxpayers, American voters have said, through YouCut, that that is exactly what we need to do.

Professor Hal Scott from Harvard Law School noted how incomplete the financial services regulatory reform legislation is. He said this: "It doesn't address GSE reform," Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, "which arguably is the most costly part of the entire bailout process. If you look at the money we've actually spent on the bailout, the GSEs are costing us billions." There is no solution from the White House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks in debate to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I would just remind the body that we're here on the FHA bill, the reformation of FHA which my friends have applauded, and that's really what we're here to talk about, a savings of \$2.5 billion, more accountability from FHA, which has had to fill a vacuum in the housing market because of the loss of so many lenders who got so involved with sub-prime loans.

So I'd also say to my friend Mr. GARRETT, Madam Speaker, that I think that sometimes if you take a look at the past actions that we saw under the Republican Party and their failure to rein in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, rein in a Wall Street that was out of control, cut taxes and not pay for wars, that gives you an idea of what they may be doing in the future. And that's what the people of this country want to have an idea of what to expect, and looking back at the past actions, I would say, gives you a good indication.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. My good friend is absolutely right. We're here today to talk about the reform of FHA and to really give relief to the borrowers who will have the ability to see the current cap on mortgage insurance premiums increase and generally give opportunity for Americans to make whole and make good on the home buyers market to get back into the market.

The sub-prime debacle, the whole foreclosure devastation, tragedy happened on the last administration's clock, the Republican administration's clock. So I wonder now when we stand here to try to help new home buyers get into the market, work with the real estate industry, and make people whole, there seems to be an opposition.

The whole GSE reform was something that could have been done under the last administration's clock, but they wanted to take a sledge hammer and axe and destroy the opportunity for individuals to be able to access the kind of moneys and resources so you could get into a home.

I support this legislation, H.R. 5072, the FHA Reform Act, because what it will do is to give Americans back their wealth again, allow them to buy homes, give them the insurance premiums that they need, and to get us back on track. This is the right direction. Let's keep going forward to help America stay strong.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5072—"FHA Reform Act of 2010". The Chair of the Financial Services Committee, BARNEY FRANK, Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, and the co-sponsors of this bill must be applauded for moving this important legislation to the floor. This legislation amends the National Housing Act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to increase the maximum annual premium payments for mortgage insurance, and makes the charging of the premiums discretionary instead of mandatory.

The Federal Housing Administration, FHA, has its origins in the post-depression era. However, in the last several years, FHA has been a major force in breathing life into the depressed housing market. With 51 percent of African Americans homebuyers and 45 percent of Hispanic families who purchased homes in 2008, using FHA financing, FHA is far and away the leader in helping minorities purchase and maintain their homes.

Subprime mortgage loans, which were at the heart of the housing crisis, were disproportionately made to blacks and other minorities. For example, Wells Fargo loan officers described the high interest rate mortgages targeted at Black homeowners as "ghetto loans," an unacceptable and terribly offensive reference. As a result, a disproportionate number of blacks and minorities have been forced into foreclosure. In predominantly Black neighborhoods, 1 in every 8 loans dispersed by the large lender, Wells Fargo, resulted in foreclosure, while in predominantly White neighborhoods, only 1 of every 59 Wells Fargo loans resulted in foreclosure.

With the increase in foreclosures, foreclosure rescue and loan modification scams have been on the rise. The Internet has been flooded with schemes by fraudulent organizations and individuals who are charging fees for counseling services, a service that HUD provides free of charge. Some of these scams go as far as to require homeowners to sign over or transfer the deeds to their homes, and many are simply absconding with the mortgage payments that homeowners are struggling to make.

Something must be done to protect these hard working Americans, who are already facing financial distress and the potential loss of their home, from these predatory schemes. The Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) was implemented just over a year ago to aide homeowners in modifying their loans as opposed to turning to these fraudulent schemes. Unfortunately, the program has been unable to keep pace with the quickening pace of foreclosures.

In 2010, over 40 years since the Federal Housing Administration was established, FHA is playing an increasingly important role in stabilizing economically disadvantaged communities, while providing assistance to families across a wide-range of incomes. As John Taylor testified before the Financial Services Subcommittee Housing and Community Opportunity, "research by Dan Immergluck shows that FHA lending is more likely in communities experiencing high unemployment, smaller metropolitan areas, metropolitan areas experiencing large home price declines, and Zip codes with lower median home values. In other words, FHA lending has increased while conventional lending has decreased in communities hardest hit by the current severe recession."

Despite this, more must be done to protect home owners and enable prospective homebuyers. This reform bill is a vital step toward that end. Section 4 of this legislation authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to terminate approval of a mortgagee to originate or underwrite single family mortgages if the mortgagee's rate of early defaults and claims is excessive. This will help to reverse the damage caused by predatory lending, and help families keep their homes. This will have a ripple effect throughout countless cities because entire neighborhoods are currently at risk of being abandoned due to foreclosures. Saving these neighborhoods will keep communities intact, and will preserve neighborhoods for revitalization that is vital to the nation's economic recovery efforts.

Section 14 of this legislation authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to reimburse servicers of HUD-insured residential mortgages for the costs of obtaining the services of specified independent third parties, including a HUD-approved housing counseling agency, to make in-person contact, at no charge, with mortgagors whose payments are 60 or more days past due, solely to provide information regarding: (1) HUD-approved housing counseling agencies; and (2) mortgage loan modification, refinance, and assistance programs. During these trying economic times, this HUD-approved counseling must be a vital tool for families at risk of defaulting on their mortgagees, as they decide on the best financial course of action at no cost to them.

It is my hope that this legislation will help to enable these disadvantaged groups, as well as struggling homeowners to retain their homes if they own one, or to buy homes for the first time if they do not. As Graciela Aponte of the National Council of La Raza testified before the Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, "communities of color, low-income families, and first time homebuyers—FHA's target market—have been disproportionately impacted by the toxic subprime mortgages on the housing market."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the FHA Reform Act of 2010, H.R. 5072. Legislation this important to the American homeowner and to our economy must be passed immediately.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I rise today on behalf of thousands of Americans who, through YouCut, have overwhelmingly asked that Congress address one of the most egregious examples of Washington's fiscal irresponsibility, the ongoing bailouts of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

These two failed mortgage giants directly fueled the financial turmoil that has cost millions of Americans their jobs, their savings, and their homes. Already, bailouts of Fannie and Freddie have cost taxpayers \$145 billion, with a final tab estimated to reach over \$380 billion, more than the entire TARP bailout.

Despite these alarming facts, the Democrat overhaul proposals designed to address the financial crisis completely ignore the two most visible and costly contributors to the crisis. Madam Speaker, there are two 800-pound gorillas named Freddie and Fannie in this room. They are responsible for over \$5 trillion for outstanding liabilities, and they are now owned by the taxpayers. The American people cannot afford the risk, and they are tired of watching Congress fail to act.

Today, with the support of thousands of YouCut participants, we have an opportunity to save taxpayers \$30 billion or more by taking immediate action to reform the failed mortgage giant. I urge my colleagues to vote against the bailouts and show the American people that Congress is listening.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would ask the Speaker how much time I have left and how much time Mr. SESSIONS has left, and I would ask my friend how many speakers he has left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. If I could answer the gentleman's question, Madam Speaker, of how many more speakers, I've got three or four more speakers.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Charleston, West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. SESSIONS from Texas and I would like to thank Mr. FRANK, the chairman of our committee, for the work that we've done on the underlying bill, the FHA reform bill. It is an important bill, and we will be debating that and talking about that quite a bit for the next 2 days.

What I've heard over the last week when I was home for the district work period is that people are really con-

cerned about the spending and overspending that's going on here in Washington. Folks in West Virginia are tightening their belts and making difficult decisions, but they don't see that happening here in Washington.

Right today, we have before us in the previous question vote, we're going to have an opportunity to make a cut in government that makes a lot of sense. Over 315,000 Americans have voted to perform this cut on government spending by voting to reform Fannie and Freddie. We estimate that we could save approximately \$30 billion over 10 years—that's significant—by ending some of the government conservatorship, shrinking their portfolios of Fannie and Freddie, establishing minimum capital standards, and bringing transparency to taxpayer exposure.

Since going into conservatorship—and many folks have been quoting this figure—the U.S. taxpayer has supported the GSEs to the tune of over \$145 billion.

□ 1400

As we heard from Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey, that is limitless, how far that can go.

One of the things I don't think taxpayers realize when they made this vote on YouCut was that recently the Treasury Department and the Federal Housing Finance Agency approved compensation packages for the chief executive officers of Fannie and Freddie of \$6 million each, including \$2 million incentive payments for each executive.

These compensation levels are 30 times that of a Cabinet Secretary, and they were approved for entities that are owned basically by the taxpayers and entities that have borrowed large sums from the taxpayers.

And I think by this YouCut vote what Americans are saying is, "Enough is enough." We have heard a lot about the past and whose fault it is, quite frankly, over the last week. I didn't hear anybody wanting to cast blame; they want people to solve problems. That's what they have sent us here to Washington to do. We need to look forward to solve these problems.

So, as we all know, both Republicans and Democrats, lots of times the American people are a lot farther ahead of us in their thinking and in their commonsense solutions. And one of these is this YouCut proposal before us today, which will give us an opportunity to put their voices before us and for us to give them a sign of approval that, yes, \$30 billion from Fannie and Freddie to save government money, to also end the conservatorship of Fannie and Freddie.

That's another thing I hear in town hall meetings across the district: People don't know who Fannie or Freddie are. They are costing each American taxpayer dollars every day to the tune of over \$145 billion in total.

So, with that, I would ask that we vote "yes" on this YouCut proposal. It makes good, common sense.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would remind my friend from West Virginia—and I do appreciate that \$30 billion over 10 years—take a look at their proposition. It is for another bill for another day. We are dealing with FHA, which saves \$2.5 billion today.

Also, I would remind her, Madam Speaker, that, over the course of this year and last year, we started drawing down in Iraq, which was costing this country upwards of \$100 billion a year, not \$30 billion over 10 years, \$100 billion a year, not paid for by the Bush administration. So, as we draw down from 160,000 troops to some 50,000 or 40,000 troops this summer, we are going to save far more money than the Republicans and this Fannie Mae proposal project.

I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) to respond to some of the things my friend from West Virginia said.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, to underline it, under authority that the Bush administration asked for and didn't get until the Democrats took over Congress, Fannie and Freddie were put into conservatorship. That's a very drastic reform of where they were.

The \$145 billion that, regrettably, is being lost was lost before the conservatorship. We put an end to those losses. And that's the current testimony of Secretary Donovan.

And then as to compensation, I welcome my friend from West Virginia, belatedly, to the cause of limiting the compensation. Because the Committee on Financial Services put a bill out to specifically limit the compensation of the GSEs. We had general compensation limitations for TARP recipients, but we had one that would have limited GSE recipients, as well. And the gentlewoman from West Virginia voted against it, as did most of the Republicans.

So we had a general compensation restriction, and we had one for—I take it back. It was any recipients of government aid, including the GSEs and the TARP recipients. And the Republican Party voted “no.” So they are now opposed to raises which they refused to vote to block. That's the pattern.

And I stress again, Fannie and Freddie have already been drastically reformed. They are in conservatorship. That is a very significant form of limitation. They are not being run remotely the way they were in the past when the Bush administration and others pushed them into buying too many loans from low-income people. And we do believe they need to be replaced, but in a way that does not further destabilize housing finance.

That's why the realtors and the home builders and a number of groups concerned about the deficit oppose this Republican plan simply to abolish them without replacing housing finance mechanisms. But they are currently being run in conservatorship.

And, again, I repeat, as Secretary Donovan said, unchallenged by the Re-

publicans when he was testifying, they are not now losing the money. The losses predated the conservatorship, and the responsible thing to do was to replace them responsibly.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), former mayor of Charlotte, North Carolina, now a Member of Congress.

Mrs. MYRICK. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people get it. They understand Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac need to be reformed.

The Federal Government has spent, as you have heard over and over, \$145 billion in taxpayer dollars to prop up these two government entities. And through YouCut, the American people have voted to have shrink the portfolios of Fannie and Freddie. And, most importantly, they have demanded transparency, something that has been missing for a long time in the Federal Government relative to spending.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these changes will save up to 30 billion taxpayer dollars. And it's no secret, we can't keep spending money that we don't have.

The American people know this, and they have gone to YouCut to have cast hundreds of thousands of votes over the last 3 weeks to demand we cut reckless spending out of our budget.

We need to do what we were sent to D.C. to do, and that is to vote for the wishes of the people that we represent back home. And a vote to reform Fannie and Freddie is a vote to save the American people, taxpayers, \$30 billion.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wheaton, Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I came here to the floor a couple of minutes ago, and I thought, “Surely, I am not going to hear and see the tired, old, symbolic show pony of George W. Bush and his administration being trotted out in this Chamber once again,” but I wasn't disappointed.

It just amazes me, Mr. Speaker, at the lack of creativity and forward-thinking and problem-solving that we see animated on the other side of the aisle, that all they can do is look in this rear-view mirror and wring their hands and moan and groan and say, “Well, it's George W. Bush's fault.” I think the American public is just tired of that. I think the American public isn't persuaded by it.

I offered an amendment very straightforwardly last night—it was offered by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas in the Rules Committee—that would have said a very simple thing. It would have said, if you are running Fannie and Freddie, if you are an employee of Fannie and Freddie, new rules. And the new rule is you are not going to make

any more than we pay the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not particularly controversial, not particularly groundbreaking, but it makes a lot of sense. I mean, if the majority has now found this robust desire to truncate compensation, why in the world wouldn't we focus in on this area that we tend to agree with?

And, frankly, the argument that these entities are no longer losing money, I think, is not persuading the citizens of the Sixth District.

I see the chairman wants to be recognized, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I only have 3 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. But the fact is that it's not losing money—whether it's persuasive or not, the fact is uncontested that it's not losing money. The CBO talks about past debt.

Mr. ROSKAM. You made that argument earlier, and I am going to reclaim my time. I have gone to the Mr. FRANK School of Floor Management and learned well.

Mr. Speaker, here was the opportunity for the majority to say, “We are going to focus in on this. We are not going to put up with any more nonsense of spending \$145 billion.” And the price tag, let's be honest, is up to \$400 billion and rising.

We know what we need to do here, Mr. Speaker. We know when to do it. And I urge us to be like-minded in stopping this approach that the majority has and a complete failure to deal with Fannie and Freddie in a responsible way, in my view, and not support the motion.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes you have to remind people from time to time about what happened in the past, because it's important. History is important.

I would remind my friend from Illinois, you know, that there was an effort to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac when it was purchasing a lot of lousy loans that have resulted in these losses. But, instead, what did the reform, the reforming of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac get back when you could have stopped these losses? We got the one-finger salute from the White House, a Republican White House that, for some reason or other, did not want to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

And I have to tell you, Mr. Oxley, by giving that statement, we got a one-finger salute. When he made his statement on September 9, 2008, he described perfectly what the White House wanted to do with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The White House, at that point, under the Bush administration, just, “Let's buy all these lousy loans. Let's just keep it going.”

Well, that bubble burst. And the American people and the Democratic Congress and the Democratic administration are having to pick up the pieces now from that imprudent, improper approach to housing finance.

We want people to have homes that they can afford in this country. If they

can't afford them, then, okay, they don't get them. The FHA bill that is before the House today provides, in a proper and prudent way, insurance for those home purchases to people who can afford and can show their ability to make these payments.

That is the purpose of the bill today. My friends on the other side want to talk about some other thing that they didn't do 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to talk about the past that the gentleman from Illinois is so desperate to cover up.

The House voted on a bill that would have limited compensation to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac executives a year ago. It was not on other corporations; it was on TARP recipients, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

It came out of committee, it came to the floor of the House, and the gentleman voted against it. If he had helped us a year ago—it passed the House but it died in the Senate—if we had been able to get that bill through, we would have limited these.

So the gentleman over a year ago—and I know that's history and he doesn't like to talk about history, particularly when it doesn't reflect well on his argument—but he voted against that limitation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The reason we talk about the history is very simple: Every dollar that is lost and is about to be lost was lost because there was a delay in reform.

The losses are not resulting from current operations. Secretary Donovan said that before the committee, and no Republican challenged him. We are stuck with losses that happened before we were able to put it into conservatorship by our votes and stop the bleeding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would ask the Speaker how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 9¼ minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank my friend for yielding.

I appreciate the revised view of history itself. For some time, my Republican colleagues have been trying to blame those of us who try to expand housing, decent housing for lower-income people, for the crisis, including Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

I think the record is very clear. Twelve years of Republican rule, no bill became law to change Fannie and Freddie Mac's operation. George Bush in 2004—not ancient history—expands, by his mandate, the number of low-in-

come loans that they have to purchase, loans from low-income people.

That is why we have the debt. That is why this is relevant. The Democrats take power in 2007 and, working with Secretary Paulson, as he documents in his book—and he notes, by the way, that some Republicans were mad at him for working with us. But the result was a good bill that allowed him to put Fannie and Freddie into conservatorship. And, post-conservatorship, we have not had the problems.

□ 1415

If you abolish Fannie and Freddie tomorrow, you wouldn't save a penny because we would still have the debts that accrued when it was run previously, an unreformed Fannie and Freddie—unreformed because the Republicans wouldn't touch it, unreformed probably because President Bush pushed them into more loans. To talk about what you do in the future you have to understand the source of the problem; that's what we get in history.

So Fannie and Freddie have been drastically changed and they are in conservatorship. The question is, what do you do next? They have played an important role in housing finance. They are playing a constructive role now as opposed to the destructive role they played before. And I was slow in recognizing that; it wasn't until 2004 that I did. But in 2005, I joined many Republicans in trying to support a bill until it was hijacked from any housing purposes. By the way, the fact that I voted against the bill finally had no impact. The bill passed the House. It died in the Senate because Senate Republicans didn't like it. Senate Democrats offered the House Republican bill; that caused the end of the war.

But let's talk about going forward. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are now run by a conservator. Unfortunately, their salaries aren't capped because the Republicans helped sabotage a bill which we supported to cap their salaries. But it is now being run in a way that helps promote financial—and does not have the mistakes of the past. There are not these problems. The money owed is money that results from past decisions that are no longer being taken because of the conservatorship.

The question is, what do you do going forward? The National Association of Realtors, the National Association of Home Builders, everybody involved in housing finance argues—very correctly, I think—that simply having Fannie and Freddie disappear—again, not the old Fannie and Freddie, they have disappeared, the agencies that caused us the problems no longer exist. My colleague from Illinois, with a fresh figure of speech, said they were 800-pound gorillas. Well, if they are gorillas, they are deeply chained, they are in cages, and they are being fed and are quite docile. Yes, they need to be replaced, but you need to take all of the various aspects of housing finance and figure

out how to do it going forward. The Republican bill doesn't do that; that's too hard.

Railing against the mistakes of the past—and they say they don't like history? But their bill is a firm statement against the operation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac before it was put into conservatorship and deals, unfortunately, with debts that we are stuck with. Going forward, how do you untangle the private shareholder corporation and a public mandate to try and subsidize housing to some extent? What agency should you have? What's the role of the Federal Housing Administration and Ginnie Mae and the private sector and the secondary market entities? We need to think about that. They haven't done that. Their bill includes nothing to replace Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. So passing their bill tomorrow—or last week—wouldn't save us anything because their current operations aren't losing money, and it wouldn't discharge us from the debts that occurred when it was being run on their watch under their rules.

We do stop the bleeding by putting them into a tough conservatorship. You can read Hank Paulson's book, and he tells you how they were going to resist that. He insisted and fired the board of directors and shareholders were substantially diminished or wiped out. And new rules, new loans are going forward that aren't the kind of bad loans that were made, and now our job is, responsibly, to try and replace it. And what you get from the Republicans is confession. They are very angry at the fact that when they were running the place in the White House and here, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were able to run up all those debts and they never were able to do anything to stop it. I didn't see that early on. I saw it—and in fact acted on it—quicker than many of them. We have now stopped the bad stuff and we are not incurring losses, and the question is, what do you do going forward? And that is a harder question than my Republican colleagues are prepared to grapple with.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I gather that the gentleman from Colorado is now, by shaking his head, through with other speakers, and I will go ahead and offer my close. And I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting that we blame George Bush, and yet he never got a bill to sign. It's a pretty interesting concept when we blame the President for something that never came to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to offer commonsense solutions to rein in the current spending spree by our Democratic colleagues. We, like the American people, would like to see some transparency and accountability from our elected leaders.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material immediately prior to vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. The legislation before us today brings some stability to the currently wavering housing market; but Americans are still concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the Democratic agenda, the Democratic agenda of taxing and spending, the Democratic agenda that the three largest political items by this Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and President Barack Obama will lose 10 million American jobs, ten million American jobs that still hang in the balance based upon the whims of this majority party.

Mr. Speaker, I think that increasing deficits, increasing spending, more taxes on business, shrinking job numbers, it's a sad day if we want to look back and blame everything on George Bush, and yet we know why this is happening. For that reason, I encourage a "no" vote on the previous question to bring some fiscal sanity and restraint to this body and a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the initial comments by Mr. SESSIONS and a number of the other Republicans about the bill that is before us—or hopefully will be before us, the FHA Reform Act of 2010, which is a bill that provides more accountability to FHA, saves money, \$2.5 billion over 5 years with FHA, and FHA has had to fill a vacuum left by a lot of the subprime lenders that made lousy loans and are now out of business. So it is a substantial agency that helps move housing in America, it is done in a prudent fashion, and the reforms in the bill make it even more prudent.

Now, my friends on the other side want to turn it into a Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac bill, but that's not what is before us. Apparently, they want to do it because they have a lot of guilt that they didn't do it 5 years ago when we could have saved this country \$100 billion or more, but it wasn't done. Even the chairman, the Republican chairman of the House Financial Services at that time, wanted to see some reforms, but the Republican Senate and the Republican administration under Mr. Bush didn't want to. And you can't be more descriptive than Mr. Oxley was when he spoke of the reception that the reforms got from the White House when he said we got a one-finger salute. I mean, that's about as descriptive as it gets. They didn't want to reform it. Now they want to reform it, and they want to forget about history.

We're here, though, on the FHA bill. We're here to help turn this economy around. You want to talk about cuts? Well, let's look at Iraq. Let's look at some other things that—there may be

savings in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac over a period of time, there are bigger savings elsewhere, and we should be looking at those things. But we've got to get this country back to work, and that's what Democrats are doing.

Under the Bush administration to January 2009, we lost 780,000 jobs in that month alone. In April of this year, we gained 290,000 jobs, a swing of well over 1 million jobs per month. We've got to get people back to work. We've got to watch spending. But we've got to get the revenue side, and we've got to get people back to work. We've got to help them with their homes. This FHA insurance bill provides a reasonable and prudent insurer to assist with the purchase and sale of homes.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1424—OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4889) to establish a term certain for the conservatorships of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, to provide conditions for continued operation of such enterprises, and to provide for the wind down of such operations and the dissolution of such enterprises. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4889.

SEC. 5. Immediately upon the final disposition of H.R. 4889, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4653) to provide on-budget status to the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of

the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4653.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from

Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1424 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 1424, if ordered; the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 989; and the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1178.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—230

Ackerman	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Adler (NJ)	Castor (FL)	Dicks
Altmire	Chandler	Dingell
Andrews	Childers	Doggett
Arcuri	Chu	Donnelly (IN)
Baca	Clarke	Doyle
Baird	Clay	Driehaus
Baldwin	Cleaver	Edwards (MD)
Barrow	Clyburn	Edwards (TX)
Bean	Cohen	Ellison
Becerra	Connolly (VA)	Engel
Berman	Conyers	Eshoo
Berry	Cooper	Etheridge
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Farr
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Fattah
Blumenauer	Courtney	Finer
Bocieri	Critz	Foster
Boren	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Boswell	Cuellar	Fudge
Boucher	Cummings	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Dahlkemper	Gonzalez
Braley (IA)	Davis (AL)	Gordon (TN)
Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Butterfield	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Caputo	Davis (TN)	Green, Gene
Cardoza	DeFazio	Grijalva
Carnahan	DeGette	Gutierrez
Carney	Delahunt	Hall (NY)
	DeLauro	Halvorson

Hare	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	T.
Heinrich	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta
Hereth Sandlin	McMahon	Sarbanes
Higgins	McNerney	Schakowsky
Himes	Meek (FL)	Schauer
Hinche	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Hinojosa	Melancon	Schrader
Hirono	Michaud	Schwartz
Hodes	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Holden	Mollohan	Serrano
Holt	Moore (KS)	Sestak
Honda	Moore (WI)	Shea-Porter
Inslee	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Israel	Murphy (CT)	Shuler
Jackson (IL)	Murphy (NY)	Sires
Jackson Lee	Murphy, Patrick	Skelton
(TX)	Nadler (NY)	Slaughter
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Kagen	Neal (MA)	Snyder
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Space
Kaptur	Obey	Speier
Kildee	Oliver	Spratt
Kilroy	Ortiz	Stark
Kind	Owens	Stupak
Kissell	Pallone	Sutton
Klein (FL)	Pascarella	Tanner
Kosmas	Pastor (AZ)	Teague
Kucinich	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Perriello	Tierney
Larson (CT)	Peters	Titus
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Tonko
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Polis (CO)	Tsongas
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Loebach	Quigley	Velázquez
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall	Visclosky
Lowey	Rangel	Walz
Luján	Reyes	Wasserman
Lynch	Rodriguez	Schultz
Maffei	Ross	Waters
Maloney	Rothman (NJ)	Watt
Markey (CO)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Markey (MA)	Ruppersberger	Weiner
Marshall	Rush	Welch
Matheson	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (OH)
Matsui	Salazar	Woolsey
McCarthy (NY)		Wu

NAYS—180

Aderholt	Dreier	Latta
Akin	Duncan	Lee (NY)
Alexander	Ehlers	Lewis (CA)
Austria	Emerson	Linder
Bachmann	Fallin	LoBiondo
Bachus	Flake	Lucas
Bartlett	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Lummis
Biggert	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel
Bilbray	Fox	E.
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Blackburn	Gallagher	Marchant
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)
Boehner	Gerlach	McCauley
Bonner	Giffords	McClintock
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter
Boozman	Gohmert	McIntyre
Boustany	Goodlatte	McKeon
Brady (TX)	Granger	McMorris
Bright	Graves	Rodgers
Dingell	Griffith	Mica
Doggett	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Donnelly (IN)	Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)
Doyle	Harper	Minnick
Driehaus	Hastings (WA)	Mitchell
Edwards (MD)	Heller	Moran (KS)
Edwards (TX)	Hensarling	Murphy, Tim
Ellison	Herger	Myrick
Engel	Hill	Neugebauer
Eshoo	Hunter	Nunes
Etheridge	Issa	Nye
Farr	Jenkins	Olson
Fattah	Johnson (IL)	Paul
Finer	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Foster	Jones	Pence
Frank (MA)	Jordan (OH)	Petri
Fudge	King (IA)	Pitts
Garamendi	King (NY)	Platts
Gonzalez	Kingston	Poe (TX)
Gordon (TN)	Kirk	Posey
Grayson	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Price (GA)
Green, Al	Kline (MN)	Putnam
Green, Gene	Kratovil	Radanovich
Grijalva	Lamborn	Rehberg
Gutierrez	Lance	Reichert
Hall (NY)	Latham	Roe (TN)
Halvorson	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Tiberi
Rohrabacher	Shuster	Turner
Rooney	Simpson	Upton
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Walden
Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Royce	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Ryan (WI)	Stearns	Whitfield
Scalise	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)
Schmidt	Taylor	Wittman
Schock	Terry	Wolf
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Sessions	Thornberry	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Barrett (SC)	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Berkley	Hoyer	Miller, George
Boyd	Inglis	Pomeroy
Calvert	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Campbell	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Ellsworth	Kilpatrick (MI)	Watson
Harman	McHenry	Yarmuth

□ 1454

Messrs. DJOU, McKEON, BILBRAY, SHUSTER, BONNER, BISHOP of Utah, WHITFIELD, and BILIRAKIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 172, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—239

Ackerman	Connolly (VA)	Gordon (TN)
Adler (NJ)	Conyers	Grayson
Altmire	Cooper	Green, Al
Andrews	Costa	Green, Gene
Arcuri	Costello	Grijalva
Baca	Courtney	Gutierrez
Baird	Critz	Hall (NY)
Baldwin	Crowley	Halvorson
Barrow	Cuellar	Hare
Bean	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Dahlkemper	Heinrich
Berman	Davis (AL)	Hereth Sandlin
Berry	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Himes
Bishop (NY)	Davis (TN)	Hinche
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Bocieri	DeGette	Hirono
Boren	Delahunt	Hodes
Boswell	DeLauro	Holden
Boucher	Deutch	Holt
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Honda
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Hoyer
Bright	Doggett	Inslee
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly (IN)	Israel
Butterfield	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Caputo	Driehaus	Jackson Lee
Cardoza	Edwards (MD)	(TX)
Carnahan	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Engel	Kagen
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Chandler	Etheridge	Kaptur
Childers	Farr	Kildee
Chu	Fattah	Kilroy
Clarke	Filner	Kind
Cleaver	Foster	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Clyburn	Frank (MA)	Kissell
Cohen	Fudge	Klein (FL)
	Garamendi	Kosmas
	Gonzalez	Kratovil

Kucinich Napolitano Scott (GA)
Langevin Neal (MA) Scott (VA)
Larsen (WA) Nye Serrano
Larson (CT) Oberstar
Lee (CA) Obey Shea-Porter
Levin Oliver Sherman
Lipinski Ortiz Sires
Loeb sack Owens Skelton
Lofgren, Zoe Pallone Slaughter
Lowey Pascarell Smith (WA)
Luján Pastor (AZ) Snyder
Lynch Payne Space
Maffei Perlmutter Speier
Maloney Perriello Spratt
Markey (CO) Peters Stark
Markey (MA) Peterson Stupak
Marshall Pingree (ME) Sutton
Matheson Polis (CO) Tanner
Matsui Pomeroy Teague
McCarthy (NY) Price (NC) Thompson (CA)
McCollum Quigley Thompson (MS)
McDermott Rahall Tierney
McGovern Rangel Titus
McIntyre Reyes Tonko
McMahon Rodriguez Towns
McNerney Ross Tsongas
Meek (FL) Rothman (NJ) Van Hollen
Meeks (NY) Roybal-Allard Velázquez
Melancon Ruppersberger Visclosky
Michaud Rush Walz
Miller (NC) Ryan (OH) Wasserman
Miller, George Salazar Schultz
Minnick Sánchez, Linda
Mollohan T.
Moore (KS) Sanchez, Loretta
Moore (WI) Sarbanes Watt
Moran (VA) Schakowsky Waxman
Murphy (CT) Schauer Weiner
Murphy (NY) Schiff Welch
Murphy, Patrick Schrader Wilson (OH)
Nadler (NY) Schwartz Woolsey
Wu

NOES—172

Aderholt Frelinghuysen Miller (MI)
Akin Gallegly Mitchell
Alexander Garrett (NJ) Moran (KS)
Austria Gerlach Murphy, Tim
Bachmann Gingrey (GA) Myrick
Bartlett Gohmert Neugebauer
Barton (TX) Goodlatte Nunes
Biggart Granger Olson
Billray Graves Paul
Bishop (UT) Griffith Paulsen
Blackburn Guthrie Pence
Blunt Hall (TX) Petri
Boehner Harper Pitts
Bonner Hastings (WA) Platts
Bono Mack Heller Poe (TX)
Boozman Hensarling Posey
Boustany Herger Price (GA)
Brady (TX) Hill Putnam
Broun (GA) Hunter Radanovich
Brown (SC) Issa Rehberg
Brown-Waite, Jenkins Reichert
Ginny Johnson (IL) Roe (TN)
Buchanan Johnson, Sam Rogers (AL)
Burgess Jones Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN) Jordan (OH) Rogers (MI)
Buyer King (IA) Rohrabacher
Camp King (NY) Rooney
Cantor Kingston Ros-Lehtinen
Cao Kirk Roskam
Capito Kline (MN) Royce
Carter Lamborn Ryan (WI)
Cassidy Lance Scalise
Castle Latham Schmidt
Chaffetz LaTourette Schock
Coble Latta Sensenbrenner
Coffman (CO) Lee (NY) Sessions
Cole Lewis (CA) Shadegg
Conaway Linder Shimkus
Crenshaw LoBiondo Shuler
Culberson Lucas Shuster
Davis (KY) Luetkemeyer Simpson
Dent Lummis Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart, L. Lungren, Daniel Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart, M. E. Smith (TX)
Djou Mack Stearns
Dreier Manzullo Sullivan
Duncan Marchant Taylor
Ehlers McCarthy (CA) Terry
Emerson McCaul Thompson (PA)
Fallin McClintock Thornberry
Flake McCotter Tiahrt
Fleming McKeon Tiberi
Forbes McMorris Turner
Fortenberry Rodgers Upton
Foxy Mica Walden
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) Wamp

Westmoreland Wittman Young (FL)
Whitfield Wolf
Wilson (SC) Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Bachus Ellsworth Lewis (GA)
Barrett (SC) Giffords McHenry
Berkley Harman Miller, Gary
Bilirakis Hoekstra Richardson
Boyd Inglis Watson
Calvert Kennedy Yarmuth
Campbell Kilpatrick (MI)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1502

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 340 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

URGING U.S. ACTION AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 989) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should adopt national policies and pursue international agreements to prevent ocean acidification, to study the impacts of ocean acidification, and to address the effects of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems and coastal economies, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 170, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]
YEAS—241

Ackerman Frank (MA) Moran (VA)
Adler (NJ) Fudge Murphy (CT)
Alexander Garamendi Murphy (NY)
Andrews Giffords Nadler (NY)
Arcuri Gonzalez Napolitano
Baird Gordon (TN) Neal (MA)
Baldwin Grayson Nye
Barrow Green, Al Oberstar
Bean Gutierrez Obey
Becerra Hall (NY) Olver
Berman Halvorson Owens
Berry Hare Pallone
Biggart Hastings (FL) Pascarell
Bilbray Heinrich Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA) Higgins Payne
Bishop (NY) Hill Perlmutter
Blumenauer Himes Perriello
Boccheri Hinchey Peters
Bono Mack Hinojosa Peterson
Boren Hirono Pingree (ME)
Boswell Hodes Polis (CO)
Boucher Holt Pomeroy
Brady (PA) Honda Price (NC)
Braley (IA) Hoyer Quigley
Bright Inslee Rangel
Brown, Corrine Israel Reichert
Butterfield Jackson (IL) Richardson
Capps Jackson Lee Rodriguez
Capuano (TX) Ros-Lehtinen
Cardoza Johnson (GA) Ross
Carnahan Johnson (IL) Rothman (NJ)
Carney Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN) Jones Ruppersberger
Cassidy Kagen Rush
Castle Kildee Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL) Kilroy Sánchez, Linda
Chandler Kind T.
Childers King (NY) Sanchez, Loretta
Chu Kirk Sarbanes
Clarke Kirkpatrick (AZ) Schakowsky
Clay Kissell Schauer
Cleaver Klein (FL) Schiff
Clyburn Kosmas Schrader
Cohen Kratochewski Schwartz
Connolly (VA) Kucinich Scott (GA)
Conyers Langevin Scott (VA)
Cooper Larsen (WA) Serrano
Costa Larson (CT) Sestak
Courtney Lee (CA) Shea-Porter
Crenshaw Lee (NY) Sherman
Crowley Levin Shuler
Cuellar Lewis (GA) Sires
Cummings Lipinski Slaughter
Dahlkemper Loeb sack Lofgren, Zoe
Davis (AL) Smith (WA)
Davis (CA) Snyder
Davis (IL) Luján
Davis (TN) Lynch Speier
DeFazio Maffei Spratt
DeGette Maloney Stark
Delahunt Markey (CO) Stupak
DeLauro Markey (MA) Sutton
Deutch Marshall Teague
Diaz-Balart, L. Matheson Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart, M. Matsui Thompson (MS)
Dicks McCarthy (NY) Tierney
Djou McCollum Titus
Doggett McDermott Tonko
Donnelly (IN) McGovern Towns
Doyle McIntyre Tsongas
Driehaus McMahon Van Hollen
Edwards (MD) McNerney Velázquez
Edwards (TX) Meek (FL) Visclosky
Ellison Meeks (NY) Walz
Engel Melancon Wasserman
Eshoo Michaud Schultz
Etheridge Miller (NC) Watt
Farr Miller, George Weiner
Fattah Minnick Welch
Filner Mitchell Wittman
Fortenberry Moore (KS) Woolsey
Foster Moore (WI) Wu

NAYS—170

Aderholt Boehner Buyer
Akin Bonner Camp
Altmire Boozman Cantor
Austria Boustany Cao
Baca Brady (TX) Capito
Bachmann Broun (GA) Carter
Bachus Brown (SC) Chaffetz
Bartlett Brown-Waite, Coble
Bilirakis Ginny Coffman (CO)
Bishop (UT) Buchanan Cole
Blackburn Burgess Conaway
Blunt Burton (IN) Costello

Critz	Latham	Reyes
Culberson	LaTourette	Roe (TN)
Davis (KY)	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Dreier	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	Lucas	Rooney
Emerson	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
Fallin	Lummis	Royce
Flake	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Fleming	E.	Salazar
Forbes	Mack	Scalise
Foxx	Manzullo	Schmidt
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Schock
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gallely	McCauley	Sessions
Garrett (NJ)	McClintock	Shadegg
Gerlach	McCotter	Shimkus
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Shuster
Gohmert	McMorris	Simpson
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Skelton
Granger	Mica	Smith (NE)
Graves	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Green, Gene	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Griffith	Mollohan	Space
Grijalva	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Guthrie	Murphy, Patrick	Sullivan
Hall (TX)	Murphy, Tim	Tanner
Harper	Myrick	Taylor
Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer	Terry
Heller	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Hensarling	Olson	Thornberry
Herger	Ortiz	Tiahrt
Hereth Sandlin	Paul	Tiberi
Holden	Paulsen	Turner
Hunter	Pence	Upton
Issa	Petri	Walden
Jenkins	Pitts	Wamp
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Westmoreland
Jordan (OH)	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Kanjorski	Posey	Wilson (OH)
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Kingston	Putnam	Wolf
Kline (MN)	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Lamborn	Rahall	Young (FL)
Lance	Rehberg	

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett (SC)	Ellsworth	McHenry
Barton (TX)	Harman	Miller, Gary
Berkley	Hoekstra	Waters
Boyd	Inglis	Watson
Calvert	Kaptur	Waxman
Campbell	Kennedy	Yarmuth
Dingell	Kilpatrick (MI)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1511

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the bill we are about to vote on allows CBO scores to be posted on the Clerk's Web site. Would it be in order to amend the bill to also include the Nation's debt clock on the Clerk's Web site?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry, nor a point of order.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a legitimate question for a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's parliamentary inquiry is not properly stated, it is a matter for debate.

DIRECTING CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO ENSURE THAT CBO COST ESTIMATES ARE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1178) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to compile the cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office which are included in reports filed by committees of the House on approved legislation and post such estimates on the official public Internet site of the Office of the Clerk, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

Without objection, this will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 22, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—390

Ackerman	Cardoza	Ehlers
Aderholt	Carnahan	Ellison
Adler (NJ)	Carney	Emerson
Akin	Carson (IN)	Engel
Alexander	Cassidy	Eshoo
Altmire	Castle	Etheridge
Andrews	Castor (FL)	Fallin
Arcuri	Chandler	Farr
Austria	Childers	Filner
Baca	Chu	Fleming
Bachmann	Clarke	Forbes
Baird	Clay	Fortenberry
Baldwin	Cleaver	Foster
Barrow	Clyburn	Foxx
Bartlett	Coffman (CO)	Frank (MA)
Barton (TX)	Cohen	Franks (AZ)
Bean	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Becerra	Conaway	Fudge
Berman	Connolly (VA)	Gallely
Berry	Conyers	Garamendi
Biggert	Cooper	Garrett (NJ)
Bilbray	Costa	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Costello	Giffords
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Blackburn	Critz	Gonzalez
Blumenauer	Crowley	Goodlatte
Blunt	Cuellar	Gordon (TN)
Boccieri	Culberson	Granger
Bonner	Cummings	Graves
Bono Mack	Dahlkemper	Grayson
Boozman	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Boren	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Boswell	Davis (IL)	Griffith
Boucher	Davis (KY)	Grijalva
Boustany	Davis (TN)	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Bright	Delahunt	Halvorson
Brown (SC)	DeLauro	Hare
Brown, Corrine	Dent	Hastings (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Deutch	Hastings (WA)
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heinrich
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Burgess	Dicks	Hensarling
Burton (IN)	Dingell	Herger
Butterfield	Djou	Hereth Sandlin
Buyer	Doggett	Higgins
Camp	Donnelly (IN)	Hill
Cantor	Doyle	Himes
Cao	Driehaus	Hinchey
Capito	Duncan	Hinojosa
Capps	Edwards (MD)	Hirono
Capuano	Edwards (TX)	Hodes

Holden	Meeks (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Holt	Melancon	T.
Honda	Mica	Sanchez, Loretta
Hoyer	Michaud	Sarbanes
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Scalise
Inslee	Miller (MI)	Schakowsky
Israel	Miller (NC)	Schauer
Issa	Miller, George	Schiff
Jackson (IL)	Minnick	Schmidt
Jackson Lee	Mitchell	Schock
(TX)	Mollohan	Schrader
Jenkins	Moore (KS)	Schwartz
Johnson (GA)	Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)
Johnson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Scott (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	Serrano
Jones	Murphy (CT)	Sessions
Kagen	Murphy (NY)	Sestak
Kanjorski	Murphy, Patrick	Shadegg
Kaptur	Murphy, Tim	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Myrick	Sherman
Kilroy	Nadler (NY)	Shimkus
Kind	Napolitano	Shuler
King (NY)	Neal (MA)	Shuster
Kingston	Neugebauer	Sires
Kirk	Nye	Skelton
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Oberstar	Slaughter
Kissell	Obey	Smith (NE)
Klein (FL)	Olson	Smith (NJ)
Kosmas	Olver	Smith (TX)
Kratovil	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Kucinich	Owens	Snyder
Lamborn	Pallone	Space
Lance	Pascarell	Speier
Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Spratt
Larsen (WA)	Paul	Stark
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Stearns
Latham	Payne	Stupak
LaTourette	Pence	Sullivan
Latta	Perlmutter	Sutton
Lee (CA)	Perriello	Tanner
Lee (NY)	Peters	Taylor
Levin	Peterson	Teague
Lewis (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Terry
Linder	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Platts	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Loebach	Polis (CO)	Thornberry
Lofgren, Zoe	Pomeroy	Tiahrt
Lowe	Posey	Tiberi
Lucas	Price (GA)	Tierney
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Titus
Lujan	Putnam	Tonko
Lummis	Quigley	Towns
Lynch	Radanovich	Tsongas
Mack	Rahall	Turner
Maffei	Rangel	Upton
Maloney	Rehberg	Van Hollen
Manzullo	Reichert	Velázquez
Marchant	Reyes	Visclosky
Markey (CO)	Richardson	Walden
Markey (MA)	Rodriguez	Walz
Marshall	Roe (TN)	Wamp
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Wasserman
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Schultz
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Watt
McCauley	Rooney	Waxman
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
McCotter	Roskam	Welch
McDermott	Ross	Whitfield
McGovern	Rothman (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Royce	Wittman
McMahon	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McMorris	Rush	Woolsey
McRodgers	Ryan (OH)	Wu
McNerney	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
Meek (FL)	Salazar	

NAYS—22

Bishop (UT)	Flake	Lungren, Daniel
Boehner	Harper	E.
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Brown (GA)	Jordan (OH)	Petri
Carter	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Kline (MN)	Simpson
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Westmoreland
Dreier		Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachus	Fattah	McCollum
Barrett (SC)	Gutierrez	McHenry
Berkley	Harman	Miller, Gary
Boyd	Hoekstra	Watson
Calvert	Inglis	Yarmuth
Campbell	Kennedy	
Ellsworth	Kilpatrick (MI)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in the vote.

□ 1520

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to ensure that cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office are available to the public."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, on June 9, 2010, I was detained and missed the vote on H. Res. 1178. I would have voted "yea" for this resolution.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4173, WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2009

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Financial Services, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4173) to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bachus of Alabama moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the 2 Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4173 be instructed as follows:

(1) To disagree to the provisions contained in subtitle G of title I of the House bill.

(2) To disagree to section 202 (relating to the commencement of orderly liquidation and the appointment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as receiver) and section 210 (relating to the powers and duties of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as receiver) of title II of the Senate amendment.

(3) To not record their approval of the final conference agreement (within the meaning of clause 12(a)(4) of House rule XXII) unless the text of such agreement has been available to the managers in an electronic, searchable, and downloadable form for at least 72 hours prior to the time described in such clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This motion to instruct directs the conferees to insist that this legislation end the possibility of taxpayer-funded bailouts once and for all by stipulating that bankruptcy is the only available option for liquidating a failed financial firm. The motion also requires that the conferees and the public, by extension, have at least 72 hours to review the contents of the conference report before its final approval.

We've heard time and time again that the Democrats "resolution authority" to wind down systemically significant financial institutions ends the too-big-to-fail doctrine and protects taxpayers. That's an outrageous and false claim. Read the bills. Both the House and the Senate let the FDIC do the following: lend to a failing firm, purchase the assets of a failing firm, guarantee its obligations to creditors, take a security interest in its assets, and even sell or transfer assets that the FDIC acquired from it.

And while the House establishes a \$150 billion bailout fund to pay for the resolution of a failing firm, with an extra \$50 billion line of credit with the Treasury if the original \$150 billion is exhausted and cannot fully fund the bailout, the Senate approach is no better. The Senate would allow the FDIC to potentially provide trillions of dollars from the Treasury in order to pay off a failed firm's creditors and counterparties in the aftermath of its failure with the hopes that the funds can be recouped at some later date. But only a hope.

The Senate bill institutionalizes backdoor bailouts that have so infuriated the American people by conferring on the FDIC the exact same tools that were used to rescue the creditors of Bear Stearns, AIG, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac with the taxpayer price tag today of over a trillion dollars. This would continue the misguided too-big-to-fail bailouts that allowed U.S. regulators to pay Goldman Sachs and other large European banks 100 cents on the dollar at the expense of hundreds of smaller institutions and companies which were considered too insignificant or small to save or to pay.

The Democrats like to call their plan a "death panel" for large financial firms, but if you read the bill, in reality, it is nothing less than the taxpayer-funded life support to pay off the creditors of the failed institutions but not necessarily all of the creditors. They could pay some of the creditors and let others hang out to dry. We saw that with AIG and other bailouts.

And don't forget the so-called too-big-to-fail institutions have only grown larger and more dominant through the regulator-directed but taxpayer-funded bailout process, a process this legislation institutionalizes.

The better, more equitable approach to dealing with failed nonbank finan-

cial institutions—the only way to make sure taxpayers are protected from paying for Wall Street mistakes—is bankruptcy, first proposed by House Republicans. Unlike the FDIC, which can funnel unlimited amounts of taxpayer cash to a failing firm's creditors as part of a so-called resolution, a bankruptcy court has neither the authority nor the funds to make creditors whole. Bankruptcy is an open, transparent process administered according to clear rules and settled precedent and preferences, preferences that, in this bill, could be disregarded.

By contrast, the resolution authority proposed by the Democrats would be carried out entirely behind closed doors with no guarantee of adequate stakeholder participation and protection and without a bankruptcy judge to ensure a fair and equitable outcome. The Democrats have been careful to include in their bill a provision that explicitly states that taxpayers will bear no losses from the government's exercise of resolution authority. But that promise, like the promise we heard in Fannie and Freddie, is an empty one, not worth the paper it is printed on.

You will remember, on this floor we heard the Secretary of the Treasury say, \$300 billion that will never be used. It was used, and almost another trillion dollars more was guaranteed.

The only way to ensure that the pockets of taxpayers will not again be picked by Wall Street and government bureaucrats with the help of this Congress—a coalition which sometimes I refer to as the reckless and the clueless—is to insist that failing firms be resolved through bankruptcy.

In conclusion, let me remind my colleagues that for 99.9 percent of core companies and all individuals who find themselves unable to meet their obligations or their creditors, bankruptcy—not a government bailout—is the only alternative. It ought to be the alternative for failing too-big-to-save corporations as well.

□ 1530

This motion to instruct would eliminate the two big to fail/too small to save double standard in the Democrat bill that has so infuriated the American people and makes bankruptcy the only option for the systemically significant firms, many of which created the crisis our economy and the American people face today. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen an elephant stick wielded on the floor of the House. The elephant stick refers to the man who's walking around the Mall here in Washington carrying a big stick, and people say, Why do you have that big stick. He said, Well, I've got to keep away all the elephants, and the people say to him, Well, there aren't any elephants here, and he said, Right, my stick works.

My friend from Alabama is determined to prevent from happening what's not going to happen, what's not authorized in the bill. It is true that we had bailouts, and of course, what we also have here is the latest in a series of stunning repudiations of the Bush administration by its former loyal followers. All the bailouts the gentleman mentioned, of course, happened under the administration of President Bush, and I believe President Bush's administration did the best they could with weak tools at the time to deal with the problem.

What we have are ways to avoid that from happening. There is reference to too big to fail. No institution will be too big to fail under this bill. They will fail. The question is, will their failure lead to consequences that you should have some ability to deal with.

We do model some of this after the FDIC. The FDIC, run by a very able appointee, Sheila Bair, a former aid to Senator Dole and a Republican appointed to the job by President Bush, had a major role in helping us decide how to do this, and it is to say, first of all, the institutions that get too far into debt will die.

My Republican colleagues were actually right in the wrong place earlier this year, which is better than their usual average, when they talked about death panels. We are legislating death panels this year but for financial institutions, not elderly women. We don't have them in the health care bill. We have them in the financial bill. There is no too big to fail institution.

I will say in the instruction motion some things that were done were not done as well as they should have been—that's why we go to a final conference—and to the extent that there are suggestions that some of these institutions might survive, we will clean them out. The Senate bill has some provisions I don't like, and section 202 of the Senate bill I hope to change.

On the other hand, the notion that in this very complex system that we have, with the debts that are out there, to only do bankruptcy is simplistic. By the way, if my Republican colleagues really believe that bankruptcy was the only way to deal with these institutions, they would have an amendment or would have had an amendment to do away with the dissolution authority in the FDIC. The major exception of bankruptcy right now is in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. We don't have simple bankruptcy for banks. We have a method given that particular relevance in the society on how you wind them down.

So, there are many things in here that I agree with. As to the conference report being open, again here I welcome my Republican colleagues as converts to the cause of openness and interbranch negotiations. When the Republicans controlled this institution for 12 years and had the Senate for most of that time, conferences were so rare that I've had to explain to Mem-

bers who came during the years of Republicans how a conference works. Now they have become great advocates of an openness they never implemented themselves.

We will have a conference, which I announced was my intention last year, last fall. It will be open. Things will be presented. They will be debated. They will be subject to amendment. They will be voted on. I was asked if they were going to be televised. Now, I am not the editorial director of C-SPAN. I hope it will be covered. I hope TV will be there. I hope it will be widely covered, and I think it probably will be given the interest.

So, when they talk about a 72-hour requirement, I expect that we will beat that. The timetable I am hoping for will have this bill done in a couple of weeks, and it should be reported out, if we can work this out by a Thursday, and not come to the House until Tuesday which is more than 72 hours. One never knows whether there is going to be some emergency, what might happen. This will be a fully debated bill.

So there are aspects of the instruction report that I agree with. There are aspects with which I disagree. Of course, we have to go to the Senate. That's why instruction motions are not binding. But I do disagree with two points.

First of all, the entirely enacted allegation that this perpetuates bailouts, they have us confused with the situation that occurred in 2008. I don't blame the Bush administration for these bailouts in part because I think some of them could have been conducted more sensibly and better and with more concern for the impact on the average citizen, but they didn't have the tools. This gives them tools that first the Bush administration and now the Obama administration has asked for, not to keep institutions alive but to put them to death in a way that does not cause great perturbation in the rest of the economy. There will be no taxpayer money expended under here. That's already done. I do not doubt that years from now they will take credit for what we had already decided to do.

The instruction motion, in other words, is a mixed bag. Some parts of it I hope we will act on. The ex-ante fund we talk about of \$150 billion, recommended to us again by Chairwoman Bair of the FDIC, many of us thought that made sense. The Senate and the administration were opposed to it. It will not survive the conference. People know that. So, to that extent, that's going to disappear anyway.

But saying that you only have bankruptcy and nothing else that helps you buffer the consequences of the failure of these institutions—and failures they will be, they will be hard to fail and will be dissolved—I think is reckless.

So I plan to vote against the motion to instruct, and given that it is such a mixed bag of things and given that it's not binding, I will predict that the out-

come is likely to be very similar no matter how this goes. That is, there are some things we are going to do, some things we have to negotiate with the Senate. We haven't got the power to order. So I think this will be a useful discussion, but I will go back to just the last central point.

There will be no taxpayer funds, and there will be no institutions that are not allowed to fail. There will be an effort—and this has to be negotiated—to work with the Senate so that we do not simply say that the consequences are of no interest, and I would repeat again. Those who genuinely believe that only bankruptcy should be used have made a major concession by not applying those rules to the banking system. If only bankruptcy should be used, then where was the amendment during the process to convert the FDIC dissolution process on which this is modelled to a bankruptcy model?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, the question before us, with apologies to William Shakespeare, to bail out or not to bail out, that is the question. The motion to instruct by the ranking member says no more bailouts. Quite simply, it cannot be said any other way. Unfortunately, whether you're dealing with the House bill or the Senate bill, they are still identifying firms that in their view are too big to fail. Now the phrase that is used is systemically significant, systemically risky, but they are identifying firms for a specific regulatory scheme, and in the House version, as the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee pointed out, is a prefunded bailout fund. In the Senate version, they drop their prefunded, but there is an infinite line of credit that the FDIC can draw upon with respect to the Treasury. Again, if you have firms, Mr. Speaker, that are too big to fail, then you are saying they can't fail. If they can't fail, then at some point you're going to bail them out.

Now, I've heard the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, on many occasions say no taxpayer funds will be used. I heard him say it seconds earlier and I know he believes it and I know he means it, but unfortunately, the track record for him and many of his colleagues on that side of the aisle in predicting such is really not very good.

The distinguished chairman was the same one who told us he didn't believe that taxpayers would be called upon to bail out Fannie and Freddie. Well, approximately \$150 billion later, we know that Fannie and Freddie did have to be bailed out, that rolling the dice was not a good strategy.

These are the same folks who also told us that the National Flood Insurance Program would never go broke, the crop insurance program, Medicare

will never go broke. We've heard it before, Mr. Speaker. To somehow believe that ultimately taxpayers were not being called upon to have to bail out these firms is asking us frankly to ignore history and to suspend disbelief. Again, it is time to end the bailouts, and the motion to instruct would do that. Too big to fail becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Again, in many respects, the bill ought to be renamed the Perpetual Bailout Act of 2010. It has the wrong scheme. Bankruptcy is the proper scheme.

Now, I know the chairman has told us, well, we have death panels for these financial firms. Well, what happened on Chrysler and GM on their so-called death panels? Well, we know that Washington decided to play favorites. Certain creditors were benefited at the expense of others. Unsecured creditors, particularly the UAW, United Automobile Workers, somehow they jet to the front of the line. Secured creditors, they go to the back of the line. It creates avenues for political favoritism in Washington, D.C. It will again lead to Washington picking winners and losers.

We know how this ends. We know that AIG refused to make counter parties whole. CIT was designated too big to fail. They got billions of dollars. They failed anyway but it was resolved quickly. It is time to end the bailouts. The Nation cannot afford to be on the road to bankruptcy. It is time to end the bailouts, Mr. Speaker, and it is time to approve this motion to instruct.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to yield to any of my Republican colleagues who will tell me why during this process they never moved to require bankruptcy as the way of dealing with failing banks. If bankruptcy is the only way to do it, why have the Republicans never proposed that we substitute for the current FDIC proposal bankruptcy? Well, I'm used to being unanswered when I ask hard questions. I think that proves the point.

I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I would say to the distinguished chairman that depositors are very different from investors, and when we have taxpayer money specifically at risk, it calls for a different regime.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, the gentleman is wrong about that because, yes, depositors are different than investors and depositors are insured, but we have deposit insurance. If you on the other side generally believe this, Mr. Speaker, they would provide deposit insurance and then bankruptcy. The gentleman's incorrectly answered the question. Deposit insurance takes care of the depositors, but there are other things that are done to try and reduce the cost to the government. So bankruptcy and deposit insurance has not been the method.

Mr. HENSARLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Is the distinguished chairman suggesting that we need deposit insurance for firms like Citigroup and Goldman Sachs? Is that what the gentleman is suggesting then?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would take back my time to say that's even by the standards of this debate wholly illogical. No, I'm not remotely suggesting that. What I'm suggesting is the glaring inconsistency between saying bankruptcy is the only way you put an institution out of business and the failure to apply that to the banking business.

By the way, I don't mean to be rude but the gentleman mentioned Citicorp. There's a bank there that has deposit insurance. So maybe the gentleman wasn't aware that the bank there has deposit insurance.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, there is another error in the comments. This is that the bill designates institutions too big to fail as systemically important. That is misleading as stated.

In fact, the bill in the House does not designate any institution as being systemically important. The only way an institution would be designated as systemically important is if it was found to be troubled. So there would be no situation in which an institution would have that label and go out and be able to do things with it.

Under the bill that we have, only a finding that the institution is in difficulty triggers a systemic importance designation, and it is accompanied with restrictions on that institution. It is exactly the opposite of this being a badge to get more loans. It is publicly identified as a troubled institution.

The last point I would make is this. Yes, there was flood insurance, Medicare, a number of things. None of them have the language we have in this bill. This bill has very specific language banning those things because we have learned from experience.

We have learned from the experience of 2008, with all those bailouts. And, again, remember, every single bailout activity was initiated by the Bush administration. And I say that not for political purposes but to indicate the inherent difficulties here.

And it was the people in the Bush administration who first said to us, "Give us different tools. We have to be able to deal with putting these institutions out of business, but not ignore the consequences."

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate: This bill very explicitly prevents bailouts. It designates no institution as systemically important. It says that regulators may step in when they find an institution to be troubled. And if they think that that troubled institution could cause damage, they don't just designate it, they put severe restrictions on it.

So it is exactly the opposite suggestion that some will be too big to fail. They will be on notice that they have to increase their capital, decrease their activity. And people will be told that if that institution does fail under this bill, those who have invested, et cetera, will be wiped out.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct. I think it is a good idea that we don't have the taxpayers bailing out eternally institutions that are bankrupt.

But there is an important thing to remember, that when an economy gets out of kilter, the marketplace demands a correction of that. And that's usually called the recession. Of course, we are not discussing here today exactly how we get into the excesses, but we do. And, unfortunately, debt gets too high and mal-investment gets too excessive, and the market wants to correct this.

Now, it's essential that this excessive debt be liquidated. It can be liquidated in two different ways. It can be written off by inflationary currency and paid off with bad money, or it can be liquidated actually through the bankruptcy process.

So I am in strong support of this, but I also want to make a point here and a suggestion to the conferees that they pay attention to the provision in the House version of our bill dealing with the Federal Reserve. And that provision is called H.R. 1207, which deals with the auditing. And there is a difference between the Senate version and the House version.

So, although we are not talking about that specifically, to me it's important, not only for the issue of oversight and transparency, but there is also an opportunity for the Federal Reserve to provide bailout provisions for certain organizations, as well. We are talking about taxpayers' funds, the appropriated funds, TARP funds and others. But when we come to extending loans, in a way this very much is a bailout.

So I would like to suggest that we look at that and stand by the House provision. We do have 319 cosponsors of this provision.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield, as you know, I was for some form of that. And I guarantee, because the Senate has acted, we will have tough auditing provisions of the Federal Reserve in the final bill.

And I do want to note to my friend from Texas that, when the Republicans offered a motion to recommit to the bill, they would have wiped out a number of things, including his audit provision. So despite the fact that my friend

from Texas temporarily abandoned his audit provision to the perils of a re-committal provision, I will join with him in reviving it.

And, as he knows, we have in our bill a severe limitation on this power under section 13(3) for making these loans. What they did with AIG will no longer be possible. There will be no more loans to individual institutions.

But he has been the leader on the audit situation, and I intend to continue to work with him to make sure it is well done.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the chairman.

And I would just like to reemphasize that it is the responsibility of the Congress to commit to oversight of the Federal Reserve, something that we have been derelict in doing. I think the mood of this House and the mood of the Senate and the mood of the country is more transparency and more oversight.

The provision in the Senate version is not adequate for an audit of the Fed. So I am encouraged that we are getting more attention because, ultimately, it is necessary that we understand exactly how the business cycle comes about and how the Federal Reserve participates in this.

Because, under the circumstances of today, on what we are doing, we are prolonging our agony. And someday I would hope to see that our recessions—and now we are talking about depressions—are minimized and shortened. And I am concerned that the programs that we are working with today are prolonging those changes.

So the most important thing that we can do is make sure that we exert our responsibilities, have oversight of the Federal Reserve, commit to these audits of the Federal Reserve, and not to endorse the idea that the Federal Reserve is totally secret, can do what they want, can bail out other companies and banks and foreign governments and foreign central banks without fully knowing exactly what they are doing.

Once again, I thank the chairman of the committee for his support for auditing the Fed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who had a major and constructive role in this bill and was pushing for things like reform of the Volcker rule before it was popular in other quarters.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise maybe to make a suggestion. I know it may drop on deaf ears, but, you know, we are about to undertake an historic event, both in this institution, the Congress of the United States, and in the United States of America, and that is to enact laws by a democratic society through their elected representatives that will cause occasions to happen that may actually save the economy of this Nation or the economy of the world.

It seems to me at this first preparation date we are awaiting the appointment of our conferees here on the House side, that we are already indicating that there will be a political flavor to this conference as opposed to an attempt by both sides of the aisle to find what is best for America and what is best for the economy of this country.

Now, I suggest, and I will concede, having worked with the chairman and Members on the other side, the ranking members and others, for these last 15 or 16 months, that this is not a perfect bill or a perfect solution. I wish it were. But I think we will all have to wait until another day of a higher order to get to perfection.

All we are trying to do here is to work in the regular order of the legal process to see if we can make certain that we don't bring down our economy or our government or the world's economy or the world governments. And that's what we are attempting to do.

Now, you know, we have all these titles, and I am probably as guilty as others, "too big to fail." And we talk about that like that's an easily definable entity. Well, in reality, it isn't.

The fact of the matter is, some things are so interconnected and intertwined and involved in our economic system that, for all intents and purposes, they would appear not to be a risky organization, but that when you examine them and you see the tentacles that they send out through our society and other organizations throughout the world, that their failure can precipitate a failure of the economic system of the world.

That's what we experienced in an organization known as AIG. You know, an organization in excess of 100,000 people, working in tens of countries around the world, had a little organization in London, England, called AIG Financial Products. Those 400 people were able to take a name, AIG, American International Insurance Group, and utilize that to get into the derivative business to the tune of \$2.8 trillion without the support of adequate assets to meet their counterparty positions.

And what happened? It started to fail to meet its counterparty positions and immediately would have put at risk most of the major banks of not only the United States but of the world.

Now, when that was happening—and that occurred after other failures in the United States had occurred—we had several choices. We could have sat by and said, "Well, the market will cure all things." And I guess if you are a purist, that's not a bad position philosophically to take, because it is correct. I will concede to that.

But I am one of those people that favor affecting the market and taking the actions that will, in some instances, short-circuit the effects of the market when the effects of the market will be so severe on our population that it warrants such action. And that's exactly what happened at AIG.

If we had sat back and allowed that to occur and the ripple effect around

the world, we would have collapsed the economy of the United States and the world, probably, some of our best economists in the world indicated, within 72 hours. We would have been in a position of no one knowing what the world's economy would have looked like.

We were called upon to take certain actions, and that was way back in September or October of 2008. And many of us came back to Washington just before our vital elections that year, and we went to work and we created something.

Can I reconstruct for you gentlemen what it was about? We didn't come back to the Obama administration. We didn't come back to a situation—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, doesn't our House rule require that the address be made to the Speaker and not to each other?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Speaker.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is certainly a pleasure to address the Speaker, and I will. I am sure we should adhere to the decorum of the House and the rules of the House, and I will definitely do that.

I wouldn't think of calling the attention of my observations to my colleagues on the other side. That could be frightful if we did that because they may have to respond to those observations. So we won't call those observations.

I was going through how we got here and why we are here. And how we got here was we met in rooms around this Capitol for a number of weeks, 2 or 3 weeks, as I recall. And the President of the United States, George W. Bush, in his last year of presidency, or in the last several years of his presidency, indicated that his Secretary of Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve were his designees to work with Congress to see what we could do to prevent the potential meltdown or catastrophe to the world's economy. And we went to work to do that.

Now, as I recall—and I sat in some of those meetings, not all of those meetings—we would periodically tune the conference telephone to economists, Nobel Prize-winning economists around the world, of all political persuasions and philosophical positions. And, to my best recollection, there were several dozen. And to a man, or woman, not one of them disagreed that what we were facing was total meltdown and that precipitous action had to be taken.

And the precipitous action that was taken was to provide a rescue package, giving unusual, incredible authority to the executive branch of government, to

be utilized by the Secretary of the Treasury, to do what we could to prevent a meltdown in the United States.

□ 1600

Now, at all times, as I recall, those eminent economists were telling us that it was their opinion that even if we did these strange and unusual activities of empowering the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow monies, use monies, buy assets, do all kinds of things, the chance of success was rated at about 50/50.

As I recall, we worked for about 2 or 3 weeks crafting what originally was a three-page bill that ultimately became a 400-page bill and became known as the "rescue" bill. We brought it to the House floor, if all of you will recall, and it failed. And the day that it failed, the hour that it failed, the half hour that it failed, the New York Stock Exchange dropped 900 points. And finally, there was a realization across the country and across the world that if this rescue package was not passed, we probably were looking at the beginning of the failure of the American economic system, and we went to work to see if we could put a coalition together to get it passed, and that took another week, if I recall.

Now, we did those things in the midst of an election. We did those things with a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, and it seems we did it pretty successfully. And we didn't call it a "bailout" bill. That became a political terminology so that people could be misinformed, misdirected, and have a visceral reaction to what the Congress has done when they really didn't understand it. And what occurred? Well, that prevailed. Rather than calling it a "rescue" bill anymore, it became known as the "bailout."

I want to correct that because I've heard that term used here at least a dozen or two dozen times. I asked the question, what did we bail out? We made extensive commitments to banks in the United States. To the best of my knowledge, all those banks have now repaid those commitments to the Treasury or to the Federal Reserve. What was the success of that? Most of them did not fail and our economic system did not fail, in totality, so it was pretty good, but we were losing employment and falling like a rock, the economy, to the tune of, in January, when the new President of the United States was sworn into office, this Nation lost 750,000 jobs and had been losing jobs at that rate for several months before and it continued several months after. And we started to get into, as opposed to discussing economics, free market situations and legalities of how we handle this problem. We got into a political ramble that has continued to this day. I think that's what I got up to address.

If we stay on this course and this direction, the only thing that's going to happen at this conference committee—

and ultimately the bills that are enacted into law and signed by the President—will be very limited-capacity pieces of legislation that will not nearly accomplish what could happen. On the other hand, I say to my friends on the other side and the Members and colleagues of this Congress, if we can put our personal prejudices, our political advantages to the side and spend the next 2½ or 3 weeks in an honest effort to get the best bill possible to reform the financial markets of the United States, and indeed the world, we can do something that is so historic in nature that we place the stability of our economy for the next 75 years as it was ably put together in the 1930s.

If we don't accomplish that, what we're going to end up with is a temporary solution to a disastrous problem, fighting a lot of silly political questions which will long disappear before most of us do from the face of the Earth, but not accomplishing anything for the American people.

So I just end this dialogue with saying this—to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, so I'm not charged with directing it towards one side—let's put our disagreements aside for the next 2 or 3 weeks. Let's listen to the chairman of the House committee and the ranking member. Let's listen to the chairman of the Senate committee and ranking member and the other 30 participants of this conference committee, with the commitment of doing the best we can within our powers to prevent this from happening, certainly in the near future, or potentially ever again. If we fail to do that, we will have failed our job.

Mr. BACHUS. May I inquire of the Speaker as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the very able ranking member of the Oversight Committee, Mrs. JUDY BIGGERT.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the motion to instruct.

Madam Speaker, taxpayers are tired of paying for the mistakes of others and fed up with bailouts. It's time for Congress to recognize that financial managers that drive their firms into insolvency should be met with bankruptcy and not bailouts.

Unfortunately, both the House and Senate financial regulatory reform bills allow the government to take over any financial business Washington bureaucrats deem as "too big to fail." In other words, if Federal regulators like Treasury Secretary Geithner fail to do their job, then these same regulators can simply take over, dismantle, or prop up any financial institution that they choose at taxpayers' expense, and that's what I would call a bailout.

That's the government picking winners and losers in the marketplace. That's the same reckless approach that caused the markets to undervalue risk, inflated the bubble, and left taxpayers to clean up the mess when it burst. And it must end.

House Republicans say "never again," and we have developed a responsible alternative—bankruptcy. It's a fair and unbiased process, insulated from inappropriate political pressures, and removes taxpayers from the equation. During a recent hearing, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City President Thomas Hoenig agreed, calling enhanced bankruptcy "a process that assures everyone that the largest institutions will be dismantled if they fail." And he continued, "I prefer a rule of law that takes away discretion from the bureaucrat or from the policy person so that in the crisis you don't have that option to bail out, so that you have to take certain steps to control, to prevent a financial meltdown."

Madam Speaker, I couldn't agree more. Effective financial reform must end the bailouts and prevent the next financial meltdown. Bankruptcy is central to the solution. It will give certainty to the marketplace, discourage risky practices, and eliminate taxpayer liability and political interference.

The bottom line is that stronger, nimble and more coordinated regulators must do their job, exercise strong oversight, and bar excessive, risky, deceptive and fraudulent marketplace behavior. Washington shouldn't control the market; it should regulate it.

Through smarter regulation and enhanced bankruptcy rules, we can prevent the next financial meltdown. Millions of American businesses and families that work together every day to play by the rules and invest wisely deserve nothing less.

I support the motion, and I hope we will have a great conference and come up with a bill; but I think this is an important motion to instruct to consider before that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The gentleman from Alabama has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that I'm intrigued. We were talking about bankruptcy, now we have a new concept—enhanced bankruptcy. We were told earlier that it should just be plain bankruptcy like everybody else. Now, apparently, there is something special so we get enhanced bankruptcy. Maybe we will have enhanced bankruptcy explained to us. And if bankruptcy is good for everybody, why does enhanced bankruptcy need to be done here, and what is it? Is it another name for doing more than bankruptcy? I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Government Oversight Committee from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 3 minutes is all I need because we're going into a process, one in which I would like to be optimistic, one in which I will have 72 hours to pore over a 2,000-page bill to see where we can make it better.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, remember 2008. I remember helping lead the charge against a wholesale bailout, a slush fund for then-President Bush to pass around \$700 billion and to pass on to the next President a piece of that left over to spend it, and if you happen to get paid back, to spend it again.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of endless bailouts of the select few. When the gentleman spoke of AIG, AIG still owes us \$100-plus billion we'll never see back, in spite of the fact that much of that money went outside the country.

I'm part of a Congress that saw the Bush administration make mistakes. I'm fortunate that I voted against it and I'm happy that I voted against it. As we go into this financial reform, I would hope that we remember Milton Friedman once said, Capitalism is a profit and loss system: the profits encourage risk-taking and the losses encourage prudence.

Mr. Speaker, we must have freedom to fail in this country. We cannot have "too big to fail." And more importantly, we cannot have the politicization of the process by picking and choosing people like Freddie and Fannie to get \$6 trillion worth of full-faith funding from the American people in order to guarantee what ultimately was to a great extent their fault. We went into a financial collapse because when homes became unaffordable, gimmicks were produced. The American people watched their government create most of those gimmicks, and even today the American Government continues to fund a 3.5-percent-down form of financing as though homes will only go up in price. So I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis to get this bill right in conference.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Oversight Committee of the Financial Services Committee who has been a major force for stability in this system, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican motion to instruct but in support of the work the House and Senate Conference Committee will begin in crafting a final bill on Wall Street reform.

For most of last year, my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee, under the outstanding leadership of Chairman FRANK, along with other committees, worked hard to produce the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The work was bipartisan; over 50 Republican amendments were accepted along with

over 20 bipartisan amendments. This package contains ideas put forward by Democrats and Republicans, as it should, creating a better and more thoughtful bill.

While the bill is large and complex, it does some very important things: it ends "too big to fail." It ends the need for bailouts and fully protects taxpayers, and it has tough new consumer investor protections that will better protect families' retirement funds, college savings, and small business owners' financial futures from unnecessary risks by Wall Street vendors and speculators. And something we were careful to do in the House bill was to make sure this new financial oversight system would focus on the true problems that created the financial crisis and not responsible actors like most community banks and credit unions.

While the bill provides needed new oversight to the \$600 trillion derivatives market, it is well balanced, allowing farmers and small businesses in Kansas to conduct good risk management and hedge their business risks in a responsible manner.

I commend the Senate for also passing a tough financial overhaul bill last month.

The conference committee should take the best ideas from both bills and combine them into one final bill that our colleagues can support and that will finally restore our constituents' trust in our financial system. I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to instruct that serves as a distraction to the need for a well-balanced, strong financial reform package.

□ 1615

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress weighs the question of Wall Street reform, the answer the American people want us to give is clear: "No more bailouts." We should give that answer by passing legislation that sends any failing financial institution to bankruptcy, not to a Federal agency that might bail it out.

The Democratic Senator who guided this legislation through the Senate agrees that bankruptcy must be our primary response to failing institutions. Bankruptcy is fair. Its rules are clear. It is administered transparently by impartial courts. It has existed for generations because of one unmistakable truth: Free enterprise without the possibility of failure is free enterprise without the possibility of success.

The Senate improved the House bill by recognizing a role for bankruptcy, but it failed to give the bankruptcy courts what they need to make that role meaningful. As a result, the legislation's escape hatch from bankruptcy, one that allows agency takeovers of

firms, threatens to become the first option under the bill.

When agencies take over firms, we all know that they will bail them out. Let's finish our work. Let's close every loophole that invites a bailout.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the vice ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want financial reform. They don't want a financial reform replay. Financial regulatory reform is something we can all agree is needed, but we owe it to the taxpayers, who have picked up the tab for the endless bailouts, to get it right.

The House and Senate bills both lead us a long way from getting it done right. Both the House and Senate bills give the government permanent authority to continue these AIG bailouts of failing firms. Both bills let the government continue to pick winners and losers by deciding which financial companies will get on the too-big-to-fail list and which will benefit from government backing. As it stands right now, these bills give the very same regulators, who, by the way, failed to get the job done right in the first place, more authority and more power. These bills don't provide real reform. They only make bailouts and government protection for failure explicit and permanent, leaving taxpayers on the hook indefinitely.

These bills reduce choices and increase the cost of credit. At a time when small businesses all across the country are having a hard time getting credit, we are going to take action now that will reduce the ability for them, leading to fewer jobs and to more unemployment in our country.

Finally, these bills fail to address the two companies that have cost the taxpayers the most: Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. \$175 billion, to date, of the taxpayers' money is already invested in these two entities. Yet this bill fails to make any attempt at any kind of reform of these two entities.

Our motion instructs conferees to fix the biggest problems with this bill by removing all of the new and permanent bailouts. Our motion says that financial companies that fail should be allowed to fail and to use the rule of bankruptcy law, not backroom deals, which give some creditors more preference over others and which give different treatment to different creditors. Our motion says that the regulators should be held accountable, that they should not be given free rein to pick winners and losers and to decide who is too big to fail. The taxpayers want the

financial regulatory system fixed, but they don't want it fixed with permanent bailouts.

Support the motion to instruct to remove the bailout provisions from this bill and insist on real protections and reforms for the taxpayers, for our financial system, and for our economy. Mr. Speaker, the American people want reform. They don't want another replay of bailouts. Support the motion.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when the gentleman from Texas was a little less harsh on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac when an important amendment that he offered was adopted over the objection of the Secretary of the Treasury, but we've all tended to evolve some on some of these issues.

I want to repeat the central theme here: History is one of bailouts initiated by the prior administration. Some have been supported by this Congress. Some have died by the administration on its own. This bill prevents that legally.

The gentleman from Texas who just spoke referred to the AIG bailout by the Federal Reserve or the Federal Reserve's picking one company or another. The power that the Federal Reserve has had for over 75 years to do that is repealed in this bill. The Federal Reserve is allowed, if there are solvent institutions that are liquid and have a 99 percent chance of repayment at least, to advance money based on their paper, but there can be no more AIGs under the Federal Reserve's authority.

The gentleman said, Well, they can get on the list of too big to fail. There is no such list. There is literally no such list. This is a hard-held myth by the Republicans. What there is is this: If the regulators have been given more power to watch you and if you say the regulators have failed, well, they were a different set of regulators. The SEC today is not the SEC under the prior administration, which looked the other way at Madoff. This is a different and tougher SEC. What they do is say to an institution that's now being much more carefully monitored, You need to be reformed. You need to be restrained. You must have higher capital requirements. You must reduce the amount you are doing.

So there is a tight limitation on what these entities can do. So the privilege of being named important is—and it's not called "important." It says you're going to be subject to stricter standards. People are on notice that the authorities are worried about you, and then it says explicitly in the bill there can be no bailouts. There have been prior cases of bailouts on all sides—the Congress, the President, both parties—but they never had this language. There is no example of this explicit antibailout language being flouted, because it never existed before, so there are no too-big-to-fail institutions.

The question between us is this: When an institution that has gotten overly indebted is put out of business, as this bill requires it to be, do you simply do that and ignore the consequences or should there be some capacity in the Federal Government to look at the consequences?

Now, again, my colleagues have not applied their own logic to the FDIC, and I hope that the final speaker will explain what "enhanced bankruptcy" is. Remember, we started out being told that bankruptcy was the answer. Bankruptcy got enhanced somewhere, and we still haven't heard what that "enhanced bankruptcy" is. We insure the depositors, but that's not all. The depositors are taken care of, but then there are costs outside of the deposit, and the FDIC is told to follow the least cost method, and that will sometimes mean spending some money to wind it down in a way that diminishes the impact.

So, apparently, even my colleagues on the other side aren't quite as devoted to bankruptcy as they think. They are not prepared to put it into the FDIC proposal. It's a form of enhanced bankruptcy, and I hope, in their remaining time, they will explain it. When they offered a recommittal motion on this bill, Mr. Speaker, they didn't say, Let's fix bankruptcy or let's do this. They said, Let's kill every single form of consumer and financial reform.

The gentleman from Texas was alluding to the consumer agency. They wanted to kill an independent consumer agency. They wanted to kill a fiduciary responsibility for broker-dealers. They wanted to kill a requirement that leverage can never go more than 15-1. This is a little piece of what they are trying to do. They remain opposed. Their view is that the regulators in prior years didn't do a good job—regulators, yes, who followed the non-regulatory philosophy of the prior administration—and they have been opposed to any single form of reform. They are cloaking that in an argument that they are stopping bailouts which are already made illegal by this bill.

Now, the instruction motion has some things in it that Members should support, and it has some things that Members should not support. It is obviously done in a way that, I think, will have an ambiguous impact, and it isn't binding in any case. So what the vote is is less important than what the message is, and let's be very clear about the message: There are no bailouts allowed under this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Capital Markets Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, would that it be true that there are no more bailouts in this

1,400- or 1,500-page bill that Congress is about to be considering in conference. Would that it be true that the American taxpayer is potentially no longer on the hook, as it has been over the last year and a half under this administration and past, as far as the bailouts that are costing the taxpayers literally tens of billions of dollars. Would that it be true that we pass a piece of legislation and be able to keep in place the laws of this country for the last 200-plus years to protect private property rights and to protect the rights under the Bankruptcy Code so that investors and institutions know exactly what they are going to get when they invest in a company, more importantly, when you are a secured creditor, that that name would actually mean what it says: You are secured by the assets of the company.

We certainly saw that that was not the case in the Chrysler situation. You had a situation where the administration basically stepped in, using taxpayer dollars, and used the system of saying, We're not going to go through bankruptcy court—as Members of this side of the aisle would suggest should have occurred—but we are going to act in an extracurricular manner and allow the secured creditors to be tossed aside and the assets of the company to be divvied up willy-nilly as the administration and others decided they would have.

Now, that's, in essence, what we will be perpetuating with this piece of legislation that's before us. What happened in that situation?

Well, in that situation, you had the unions, which basically had no interest in that company whatsoever, end up with basically a 55 percent interest in the company at the end of the day, basically a gift valued at \$4.5 billion, and Fiat was given a 20 percent stake for free to take it over. At the end of the day, the secured creditors who thought that they should have been at the front of the line, well, ended up at the end of the line. Instead of getting, maybe, 43 cents on the dollar, they ended up getting some 29 cents on the dollar and said, You should be happy about it.

Why do I bring up that case? Because, basically, at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be perpetuating that same sort of ability for regulators to be making those same decisions going forward. Yes, maybe they won't be able to give it to their friends again at the unions like they did in this case. Maybe they will. We're really not sure.

Yet, at the end of the day, we'll be perpetuating the ability to say to secured creditors, secured creditors, you want to make an investment in a company, thinking that you are secured and that if the company were to fail and to go into bankruptcy that you would be first in line. Guess what? That is not going to be the case.

We are going to put into statute a system to say that an unelected bureaucratic regulator is going to say,

Maybe not. Not so fast, secured creditor. Not so fast, investor. We're going to put someone else ahead of you.

You know, that actually happened to real-life people in the case of the Chrysler situation where three Indiana pension funds—representing who?—policemen, firemen, what have you, thought they were secured creditors. At the end of the day, they said that they were stripped of their rights by a system that this bill will perpetuate. This is what we were trying to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BACHUS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

We have the idea that the "rule of law" should mean something in this country, and it has meant something for the last 200-plus years, and the Bankruptcy Code is part of that law.

You know, an article published in the UCLA Law School said, "What happened" over this last year and a half "was so outrageous and illegal that, until March of this year, 2009, nobody even conceptualized it."

The judge in that case that I was referring to commented from the bench that the poor pension manager from Indiana, who was representing the teachers and the firemen and the like, was kind of like the gentleman in Tiananmen Square when the tanks came rolling over.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the investors in this country, whether they be firemen or policemen or other senior citizens down in Florida or in other places around the country, to feel like they did in that case. I want them to know that their rights are protected by the rule of law through the bankruptcy process and not by some politically appointed bureaucrats or regulators who can strip them of their rights. That is what Republicans stand for, and that is why we are opposed to this language in the majority's bill.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time left on both sides, knowing that I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has 3 minutes remaining. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The gentleman from Alabama has the right to close.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, we heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania say that there were really no bailouts. I think, if you submit that statement to the American people, they would tell you that there were bailouts because, in fact, there were bailouts.

The majority has made a statement on the floor of the House in defense of this bill that it has all been paid back. Well, in fact, it has not all been paid back, and I think, on further examination, Mr. Speaker, we would all have to remember the inconvenient fact that AIG still owes the American people about \$150 billion and that Freddie and Fannie not only owe hundreds of bil-

lions of dollars but that the President, back on December 25, guaranteed their obligations, which could run in the trillions.

Now, in addition to all of that, a few statements by the chairman, Mr. Speaker.

The chairman says that they have to be troubled, that instead of going through bankruptcy, they will go through this thing where you can guarantee their obligations, where you can take a security interest in them, where you can purchase their assets, where you can lend money to them. They have to be troubled.

Well, who decides that?

Well, according to the bill, the Secretary of the Treasury sits at the head of a small group. I think the Senate bill includes Ms. Elizabeth Warren, but it includes the OCC.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. Yes, I will yield.

□ 1630

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The statement that the Senate bill includes Elizabeth Warren is breathtaking. I do not believe the Senate bill refers to Elizabeth Warren.

Mr. BACHUS. Well, I will withdraw that statement. I am glad to hear that it does not.

Now, let me ask you this. This bill, and I'm going to quote from section 210, it says that the FDIC is authorized to borrow up to 90 percent of the fair value of the failed firm's total consolidated assets. Ninety percent of the total consolidated assets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman, maybe he can give us this figure or review my figures. But the largest corporation in America, Bank of America, which would qualify under this program has total assets of \$2.34 trillion. That means that the FDIC could borrow \$2 trillion.

Now, I would ask this: Where do they borrow it from? But, more importantly, if they borrow \$2 trillion to allow Bank of America to go into this process, if they are not paid back, who pays it? And the answer is: the taxpayers, a \$2 trillion investment right there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 1330, H.R. 5278, and H.R. 5133, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 217, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—198

Aderholt	Gerlach	Nunes
Akin	Giffords	Olson
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Owens
Austria	Gohmert	Paul
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Paulsen
Bachus	Granger	Pence
Bartlett	Graves	Perriello
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Peterson
Biggart	Guthrie	Petri
Blibray	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bilirakis	Halvorson	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Blunt	Heinrich	Price (GA)
Boehner	Heller	Putnam
Bonner	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bono Mack	Herger	Rehberg
Boozman	Hodes	Reichert
Boucher	Hunter	Rodriguez
Boustany	Issa	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Bright	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Jones	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Jordan (OH)	Rooney
Ginny	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	King (NY)	Roskam
Burgess	Kingston	Royce
Burton (IN)	Kirk	Ryan (OH)
Buyer	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Cantor	Lamborn	Schauer
Cao	Lance	Schmidt
Capito	Latham	Schock
Carter	LaTourette	Schrader
Cassidy	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Lee (NY)	Sessions
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Childers	Linder	Shimkus
Coble	LoBiondo	Shuster
Coffman (CO)	Lucas	Simpson
Cole	Luetkemeyer	Skelton
Conaway	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Connolly (VA)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NJ)
Courtney	E.	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Mack	Space
Culberson	Manzullo	Spratt
Davis (KY)	Marchant	Stearns
Dent	Markey (CO)	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Taylor
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCaul	Teague
Djout	McClintock	Terry
Dreier	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	McIntyre	Thornberry
Edwards (TX)	McKeon	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McMorris	Tiberi
Emerson	Rodgers	Turner
Fallin	McNerney	Upton
Flake	Mica	Walden
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Minnick	Whitfield
Fox	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Gallegly	Myrick	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer	Young (FL)

NAYS—217

Ackerman	Butterfield	Dahlkemper
Adler (NJ)	Capps	Davis (AL)
Altmire	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Andrews	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Arcuri	Carnahan	DeFazio
Baca	Carney	DeGette
Baird	Carson (IN)	Delahunt
Baldwin	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Barrow	Chandler	Deutch
Bean	Chu	Dicks
Becerra	Clarke	Dingell
Berman	Clay	Doggett
Berry	Cleaver	Donnelly (IN)
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Driehaus
Blumenauer	Conyers	Edwards (MD)
Bocchieri	Cooper	Ellison
Boren	Costa	Ellsworth
Boswell	Costello	Engel
Boyd	Critz	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Etheridge
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Farr
Brown, Corrine	Cummings	Fattah

Filner	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Luján	Ruppersberger
Frank (MA)	Lynch	Rush
Fudge	Maffei	Salazar
Garamendi	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	T.
Gordon (TN)	Marshall	Sanchez, Loretta
Grayson	Matheson	Sarbanes
Green, Al	Matsui	Schakowsky
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Grijalva	McCollum	Schwartz
Gutierrez	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Hall (NY)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hare	McMahon	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sestak
Hereth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)	Shea-Porter
Hill	Melancon	Sherman
Himes	Michaud	Shuler
Hinchey	Miller (NC)	Sires
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Slaughter
Hirono	Mollohan	Smith (WA)
Holden	Moore (KS)	Snyder
Holt	Moore (WI)	Speier
Honda	Moran (VA)	Stark
Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
Inlee	Murphy (NY)	Sutton
Israel	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Jackson (IL)	Nadler (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Tierney
Johnson (GA)	Nye	Titus
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Tonko
Kagen	Obey	Oliver
Kanjorski	Oliver	Ortiz
Kaptur	Ortiz	Pallone
Kildee	Pallone	Pascarell
Kilroy	Pascarell	Van Hollen
Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Kissell	Payne	Visclosky
Klein (FL)	Perlmutter	Walz
Kratovil	Peters	Wasserman
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Langevin	Polis (CO)	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Watt
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Waxman
Lee (CA)	Rahall	Weiner
Levin	Rangel	Welch
Lewis (GA)	Reyes	Wilson (OH)
Lipinski	Richardson	Woolsey
Loeback	Ross	Wu
Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)	Higgins	McHenry
Berkley	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Inglis	Quigley
Campbell	Kennedy	Watson
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	
Harman	Kosmas	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1702

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. HOLDEN, CRITZ, PETERS, Ms. BEAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. RICHARDSON, Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, DONNELLY of Indiana, WILSON of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY, Messrs. TIERNEY, CARSON of Indiana, MARSHALL, COOPER, FATTAH, ANDREWS, AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. SCOTT of Georgia, PAYNE, ROSS, BERRY, ELLISON, BISHOP of Georgia, SHERMAN, DRIEHAUS, LANGEVIN, CLYBURN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SUTTON, Messrs. WEINER, SCOTT of Virginia, and RUSH, and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SULLIVAN, RODRIGUEZ, CONNOLLY of Virginia, and BOEHNER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD OCEAN DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1330) recognizing June 8, 2010, as World Ocean Day, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 369, noes 44, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—369

Ackerman	Castle	Fattah
Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Filner
Adler (NJ)	Chandler	Flake
Altman	Chu	Forbes
Andrews	Clarke	Fortenberry
Arcuri	Clay	Foster
Austria	Cleaver	Fox
Baca	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Bachmann	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Cohen	Fudge
Baird	Cole	Gallely
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Barrow	Conyers	Gerlach
Bartlett	Cooper	Giffords
Bean	Costa	Gingrey (GA)
Becerra	Costello	Gonzalez
Berman	Courtney	Goodlatte
Berry	Crenshaw	Gordon (TN)
Biggart	Critz	Granger
Bilbray	Crowley	Graves
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Cuberson	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Dahlkemper	Griffith
Blunt	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Boccieri	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Boehner	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Bonner	DeFazio	Hall (NY)
Bono Mack	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Boozman	Delahunt	Halvorson
Boren	DeLauro	Hare
Boswell	Dent	Harper
Boucher	Deutch	Hastings (FL)
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heinrich
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Braley (IA)	Dicks	Hensarling
Bright	Dingell	Hereth Sandlin
Brown (SC)	Djou	Hill
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Himes
Brown-Waite,	Donnelly (IN)	Hinchey
Ginny	Doyle	Hinojosa
Buchanan	Dreier	Hirono
Butterfield	Driehehaus	Hodes
Buyer	Edwards (MD)	Holden
Camp	Edwards (TX)	Holt
Cao	Ehlers	Honda
Capito	Ellison	Hoyer
Capps	Ellsworth	Hunter
Capuano	Engel	Inlee
Cardoza	Eshoo	Israel
Carnahan	Etheridge	Issa
Carney	Fallin	Jackson (IL)
Carson (IN)	Farr	Jackson Lee
Carter		(TX)

Johnson (IL)	Miller (MI)	Schauer
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (NC)	Schiff
Jones	Miller, George	Schmidt
Jordan (OH)	Minnick	Schock
Kagen	Mitchell	Schrader
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Schwartz
Kaptur	Moore (KS)	Scott (GA)
Kildee	Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)
Kilroy	Moran (VA)	Sensenbrenner
Kind	Murphy (CT)	Serrano
King (NY)	Murphy (NY)	Sessions
Kingston	Murphy, Patrick	Sestak
Kirk	Murphy, Tim	Shea-Porter
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Myrick	Sherman
Kissell	Nadler (NY)	Shuler
Klein (FL)	Napolitano	Shuster
Kline (MN)	Neal (MA)	Simpson
Kosmas	Nye	Sires
Kratovil	Oberstar	Skelton
Kucinich	Obey	Slaughter
Lance	Olson	Smith (NE)
Langevin	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Larsen (WA)	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Larson (CT)	Owens	Smith (WA)
Latham	Pallone	Snyder
LaTourette	Pascarell	Space
Latta	Pastor (AZ)	Speier
Lee (CA)	Paulsen	Spratt
Lee (NY)	Payne	Stark
Levin	Pence	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Perlmutter	Stupak
Lewis (GA)	Perriello	Sullivan
Lipinski	Peters	Sutton
LoBiondo	Peterson	Tanner
Loeback	Petri	Taylor
Lofgren, Zoe	Pingree (ME)	Teague
Lowey	Pitts	Terry
Lucas	Platts	Thompson (CA)
Luján	Polis (CO)	Thompson (MS)
Lungren, Daniel	Pomeroy	Thompson (PA)
E.	Posey	Thornberry
Lynch	Price (NC)	Tiberi
Mack	Putnam	Tierney
Maffei	Radanovich	Titus
Maloney	Rahall	Tonko
Manzullo	Rangel	Towns
Marchant	Reichert	Tsongas
Markey (CO)	Reyes	Turner
Markey (MA)	Richardson	Upton
Marshall	Rodriguez	Van Hollen
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Walden
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Walz
McCaul	Rooney	Wamp
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wasserman
McCollum	Roskam	Schultz
McCotter	Ross	Waters
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Watt
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Royce	McIntyre	Weiner
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Welch
McMahon	Rush	Whitfield
McMorris	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (OH)
Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
McNerney	Salazar	Wittman
Meeks (NY)	Sánchez, Linda	Wolf
Melancon	T.	Woolsey
Mica	Sanchez, Loretta	Wu
Michaud	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Miller (FL)	Schakowsky	Young (FL)

NOES—44

Akin	Davis (KY)	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Duncan	Neugebauer
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Paul
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Brown (GA)	Herger	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Jenkins	Scalise
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Cantor	King (IA)	Shimkus
Cassidy	Lamborn	Tiaht
Chaffetz	Linder	Westmoreland
Coffman (CO)	Luetkemeyer	Young (AK)
Conaway	Lummis	

NOT VOTING—18

Barrett (SC)	Harman	Kilpatrick (MI)
Berkley	Higgins	McHenry
Calvert	Hoekstra	Meek (FL)
Campbell	Inglis	Miller, Gary
Davis (TN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Gohmert	Kennedy	Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1710

Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCING SECOND ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the bipartisan Women Members of Congress softball team, we want to once again extend an invitation to all Members, staff, and anyone listening to attend the second annual congressional women's softball game, which will occur next Wednesday night at 7 p.m. at Guy Mason Field, once again benefiting the Young Survival Coalition, which is a young women's breast cancer organization.

We really thank all of the Members and staff who came out last year. Over 400 people attended. We raised \$50,000 for the Young Survival Coalition. And this year, captained by myself and my colleague from Missouri, JO ANN EMERSON, Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, and LISA MURKOWSKI, the team members are DONNA EDWARDS, GRACE NAPOLITANO, JEAN SCHMIDT, LAURA RICHARDSON, BETSY MARKEY, BETTY SUTTON, LINDA SANCHEZ, SUSAN DAVIS, KATHY DAHLKEMPER, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, DEBBIE HALVORSON, Senator KAY HAGAN, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, KATHY CASTOR, SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN, and NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ.

With that, I yield to my good friend from the State of Missouri.

Ms. EMERSON. Thank you all for listening. I thought I would fill in a little more about the details of our softball game next week.

Our coaches are ED PERLMUTTER, JOE BACA, SANDY LEVIN, and JOE DONNELLY.

The team we are playing this year are the women members of the Congressional Press Corps, led by Dana Bash of CNN, Susan Milligan and Shailagh Murray of the Washington Post. Andrea Mitchell of MSNBC and Susan Mulligan of the Boston Globe will be the official announcers of the game. Michelle Fenty, the first lady of Washington, D.C., will throw out the honorary first pitch.

The Silver Slugger sponsor is the Congressional Federal Credit Union. It costs nothing to come watch us, and I want you all to know how much better we are this year than we were last year, with excellent coaching and lots more practice.

If you want to find out any more information about this very, very fun opportunity on June 16, go to www.facebook.com/congressionalsoftball2010. We encourage all of you to come out and support us on both sides of the aisle. It helps energize us. We want you to know we're pretty good this year, and we're going to win.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, we want to emphasize that this is a frustrating process at times, but the women of the Congress, both the House and the Senate, not only know how to have a good time, know how to play softball, but they know how to get along and suggest that our male colleagues could take a page from our book. We look forward to seeing you at the game.

PRESIDENT RONALD W. REAGAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5278) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 405 West Second Street in Dixon, Illinois, as the “President Ronald W. Reagan Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—416

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beceerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine

Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler

Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger

Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires

Skelton Thompson (CA) Wasserman
Slaughter Thompson (MS) Schultz
Smith (NE) Thompson (PA) Waters
Smith (NJ) Thornberry Watt
Smith (TX) Tiahrt Waxman
Smith (WA) Tiberi Weiner
Snyder Tierney Welch
Space Titus Westmoreland
Speier Tonko Whitfield
Spratt Towns Wilson (OH)
Stark Tsongas Wilson (SC)
Stearns Turner Wittman
Stupak Upton Wolf
Sullivan Van Hollen Woolsey
Sutton Velázquez Wu
Tanner Visclosky Yarmuth
Taylor Walden Young (AK)
Teague Walz Young (FL)
Terry Wamp

NOT VOTING—15

Barrett (SC) Harman Kilpatrick (MI)
Berkley Higgins McHenry
Boehner Hoekstra Miller, Gary
Calvert Inglis Quigley
Campbell Kennedy Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1722

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF SERGEANT FRANK T. CARVILL AND LANCE CORPORAL MICHAEL A. SCHWARZ POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5133) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the “Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—409

Ackerman Alexander Austria
Aderholt Altmire Baca
Adler (NJ) Andrews Bachmann
Akin Arcuri Bachus

Baird Baldwin Dreier
Baldwin Driehaus Latham
Barrow Duncan LaTourette
Bartlett Edwards (MD) Latta
Barton (TX) Edwards (TX) Lee (CA)
Bean Ehlers Lee (NY)
Becerra Ellison Levin
Berkley Emerson Lewis (CA)
Berman Engel Lewis (GA)
Berry Eshoo Linder
Biggett Etheridge Lipinski
Bilbray Fallin LoBiondo
Bilirakis Farr Loeb sack
Bishop (GA) Fattah Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (NY) Filner Lowey
Bishop (UT) Flake Lucas
Blackburn Fleming Luetkemeyer
Blumenauer Forbes Luján
Blunt Fortenberry Lummis
Boccheri Lungren, Daniel
Bonner Foxx E.
Bono Mack Frank (MA)
Boozman Franks (AZ)
Boren Frelinghuysen Lynch
Boucher Fudge Mack
Boustany Gallegly Maloney
Boyd Garamendi Manzullo
Brady (PA) Garrett (NJ) Marchant
Brady (TX) Gerlach Markey (CO)
Braley (IA) Giffords Markey (MA)
Bright Gingrey (GA) Marshall
Broun (GA) Gohmert Matheson
Brown (SC) Gonzalez Matsui
Brown, Corrine Goodlatte McCarthy (CA)
Brown-Waite, Gordon (TN) McCarthy (NY)
Ginny McCaul
Buchanan Granger McClintock
Burgess Graves McCollum
Burton (IN) Grayson McCotter
Butterfield Green, Al McDermott
Buyer Green, Gene McGovern
Camp Griffith McIntyre
Cantor Grijalva McKeon
Cao Guthrie McMahon
Capito Gutierrez McMorris
Capps Hall (NY) Rodgers
Capuano Hall (TX) McNeerney
Cardoza Halvorson Meek (FL)
Carnahan Hare Meeks (NY)
Carney Harper Melancon
Carson (IN) Hastings (FL) Mica
Carter Hastings (WA) Michaud
Cassidy Heinrich Miller (FL)
Castle Heller Miller (MI)
Castor (FL) Hensarling Miller (NC)
Chaffetz Herger Miller, George
Chandler Hereth Sandlin Minnick
Childers Hill Mitchell
Chu Himes Mollohan
Clarke Hinchey Moore (KS)
Clay Hinojosa Moore (WI)
Cleave Hirono Moran (KS)
Clyburn Hodes Moran (VA)
Coble Holden Murphy (CT)
Coffman (CO) Holt Murphy (NY)
Cohen Honda Murphy, Patrick
Cole Hunter Murphy, Tim
Cole Inslee Myrick
Conaway Israel Nadler (NY)
Connolly (VA) Issa Napolitano
Conyers Jackson (IL) Neal (MA)
Cooper Jackson Lee Neugebauer
Costa (TX) Nunes
Costello Jenkins Nye
Courtney Johnson (GA) Oberstar
Crenshaw Johnson (IL) Obey
Critz Johnson, E. B. Olson
Crowley Johnson, Sam Oliver
Cuellar Jones Ortiz
Culberson Jordan (OH) Owens
Cummings Kagen Pallone
Dahlkemper Kagen Pascarell
Davis (CA) Kaptur Pastor (AZ)
Davis (IL) Kildee Paul
Davis (KY) Kilroy Paulsen
Davis (TN) Kind Payne
DeFazio King (IA) Pence
DeGette King (NY) Perlmutter
Delahunt Kingston Perriello
DeLauro Kirkpatrick (AZ) Peters
Dent Kissell Peterson
Deutch Klein (FL) Petri
Diaz-Balart, L. Kline (MN) Pingree (ME)
Diaz-Balart, M. Kosmas Platts
Dicks Kratovil Poe (TX)
Dingell Kucinich Polis (CO)
Djou Lamborn Pomeroy
Doggett Lance Posey
Donnelly (IN) Langevin Price (GA)
Doyle Larsen (WA) Price (NC)

Putnam Schrader Thornberry
Radanovich Schwartz Tiahrt
Rahall Scott (GA) Tiberi
Rangel Scott (VA) Tierney
Rehberg Sensenbrenner Titus
Reichert Serrano Tonko
Reyes Sessions Towns
Richardson Sestak Tsongas
Rodriguez Shadegg Turner
Roe (TN) Shea-Porter Upton
Rogers (AL) Sherman Van Hollen
Rogers (KY) Shimkus Velázquez
Rogers (MI) Shuler Visclosky
Rohrabacher Shuster Walden
Rooney Simpson Walz
Ros-Lehtinen Sires Wamp
Roskam Skelton Wasserman
Ross Slaughter Schultz
Rothman (NJ) Smith (NE)
Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ)
Royce Smith (WA)
Ruppersberger Snyder
Rush Space
Ryan (OH) Speier
Ryan (WI) Spratt
Salazar Stark
Sanchez, Linda Stearns
T. Stupak
Sanchez, Loretta Sutton
Sarbanes Tanner
Scalise Taylor
Schakowsky Teague
Schauer Terry
Schiff Thompson (CA)
Schmidt Thompson (MS)
Schock Thompson (PA)

NOT VOTING—22

Barrett (SC) Higgins Miller, Gary
Boehner Hoekstra Pitts
Boswell Hoyer Quigley
Calvert Inglis Smith (TX)
Campbell Kennedy Sullivan
Davis (AL) Kilpatrick (MI)
Ellsworth Kirk Watson
Harman McHenry

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1729

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend to several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Republican Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4173; “aye” on final passage of H. Res. 1330; “aye” on final passage of H.R. 5278; and “aye” on final passage of H.R. 5133.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, on June 8th I regret I was not present to vote on H.R. 1061 and H. Res. 518. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on both bills (rollcall Nos. 337–338). Today, had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 339—“no”; rollcall No. 340—“no” rollcall No. 341—“no”; rollcall No. 342—“aye” rollcall No. 343—“aye”; rollcall No. Vote 344—“aye”; rollcall No. 345—“aye”; rollcall No. 346—“aye.”

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4173, WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2009

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIGHT). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, KANJORSKI, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, WATT, MEEKS of New York, MOORE of Kansas, Ms. KILROY, Messrs. PETERS, BACHUS, ROYCE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. HENSARLING, and GARRETT of New Jersey.

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of subtitles A and B of title I, sections 1303, 1609, 1702, 1703, title III (except sections 3301 and 3302), sections 4205(c), 4804(b)(8)(B), 5008, and 7509 of the House bill, and section 102, subtitle A of title I, sections 406, 604(h), title VII, title VIII, sections 983, 989E, 1027(j), 1088(a)(8), 1098, and 1099 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. PETERSON, BOSWELL, and LUCAS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 3009, 3102(a)(2), 4001, 4002, 4101-4114, 4201, 4202, 4204-4210, 4301-4311, 4314, 4401-4403, 4410, 4501-4509, 4601-4606, 4815, 4901, and that portion of section 8002(a)(3) which adds a new section 313(d) to title 31, United States Code, of the House bill, and that portion of section 502(a)(3) which adds a new section 313(d) to title 31, United States Code, sections 722(e), 1001, 1002, 1011-1018, 1021-1024, 1027-1029, 1031-1034, 1036, 1037, 1041, 1042, 1048, 1051-1058, 1061-1067, 1101, and 1105 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WAXMAN, RUSH, and BARTON of Texas.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 1101(e)(2), 1103(e)(2), 1104(i)(5) and (i)(6), 1105(h) and (i), 1110(c) and (d), 1601, 1605, 1607, 1609, 1610, 1612(a), 3002(c)(3) and (c)(4), 3006, 3119, 3206, 4205(n), 4306(b), 4501-4509, 4603, 4804(b)(8)(A), 4901(c)(8)(D) and (e), 6003, 7203(a), 7205, 7207, 7209, 7210, 7213-7216, 7220, 7302, 7507, 7508, 9004, 9104, 9105, 9106(a), 9110(b), 9111, 9118, 9203(c), and 9403(b) of the House bill, and sections 112(b)(5)(B), 113(h), 153(f), 201, 202, 205, 208-210, 211(a) and (b), 316, 502(a)(3), 712(c), 718(b), 723(a)(3), 724(b), 725(c), 728, 731, 733, 735(b), 744, 748, 753, 763(a), (c) and (i), 764, 767, 809(f), 922, 924, 929B, 932, 991(b)(5), (c)(2)(G) and (c)(3)(H), 1023(c)(7) and (c)(8), 1024(c)(3)(B), 1027(e), 1042, 1044(a), 1046(a), 1047, 1051-1058, 1063, 1088(a)(7)(A), 1090, 1095, 1096, 1098, 1104, 1151(b), and 1156(c) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONYERS, BERMAN, and SMITH of Texas.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 1000A, 1007, 1101(e)(3), 1203(d), 1212, 1217, 1254(c), 1609(h)(8)(B),

1611(d), 3301, 3302, 3304, 4106(b)(2) and (g)(4)(D), 4604, 4801, 4802, 5004, 7203(a), 7409, and 8002(a)(3) of the House bill, and sections 111(g), (i) and (j), 152(d)(2), (g) and (k), 210(h)(8), 319, 322, 404, 502(a)(3), 723(a)(3), 748, 763(a), 809(g), 922(a), 988, 989B, 989C, 989D, 989E, 1013(a), 1022(c)(6), 1064, 1152, and 1159(a) and (b) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. TOWNS, CUMMINGS, and ISSA.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sections 1071 and 1104 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. SHULER, and GRAVES.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5072 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

FHA REFORM ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1424 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5072.

□ 1739

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5072) to improve the financial safety and soundness of the FHA mortgage insurance program, with Mrs. HALVORSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, I stand in strong support of H.R. 5072, the FHA Reform Act of 2010.

This bill is the product of three hearings on FHA in the past 6 months and bipartisan work with the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, Congresswoman CAPITO. In fact, this bill contains most of the provisions Congresswoman CAPITO included in her bill on FHA introduced earlier this year.

Moreover, I am proud to say that this bill passed out of the Financial Services Committee on a simple voice vote back in April.

The FHA Reform Act is critical, timely, and important for households across the country. The act will enable the FHA to respond to the current housing and economic crisis and continue its mission of providing homeownership opportunities to millions of Americans.

We know that now, more than ever, preserving this mission is critical. As the private market has contracted, FHA has stepped into the void and injected much-needed credit into our mortgage system. Increasingly, it is the only option available for American homebuyers with less than a 20 percent down payment.

FHA insurance has been particularly important for minority communities, low-income families, and first-time homebuyers. The bill would provide FHA with more flexibility to adjust their annual mortgage insurance premium.

As I understand it, if FHA limits the premium increase to 0.90 percent, as Commissioner Stevens has indicated, new borrowers will see their monthly payments rise by about \$42 a month.

Now, while I am reluctant to support providing FHA with more flexibility, I believe that this provision is needed to keep FHA financially healthy. We have also taken steps to ensure that FHA requirements are not excessively onerous for homebuyers.

Secondly, this bill provides FHA with the authority to crack down on lenders that use fraud or misrepresentation or don't originate or underwrite loans in accordance with FHA guidelines. FHA has already taken steps to increase its lender enforcement activities, and the provisions included in this bill will empower them to rout out the bad actors while reserving the program for the lenders that follow the rules.

Thirdly, this bill empowers FHA to improve their internal controls that improve data tracking, risk management, and reporting to the public and to Congress. This includes improving monitoring of early defaults and claims, tracking mortgage information by loan servicers, providing FHA with the ability to contract out for additional credit risk analyses, requiring mortgagees to report to FHA when they stop buying loans from other mortgagees, and requiring a GAO study on FHA.

The bill also creates a new Deputy Assistant Secretary at FHA for risk management and regulatory affairs.

I believe the bill in front of us today is critical for ensuring a strong future for FHA, and I request my colleagues' support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the chairwoman, Chairwoman WATERS, and the chairman of the full committee, Chairman FRANK, and Ranking Member BACHUS for their good, hard work on this legislation.

As I am an original cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in full support of H.R. 5072, the FHA Reform Act of 2010. H.R. 5072 amends the National Housing Act to include enforcement and premium changes to the FHA single-family mortgage insurance program that will improve the insurance fund's financial condition and enhance certain enforcement tools to protect against fraudulent or poorly underwritten and insured loans.

The bill incorporates a majority of the provisions in a bill that I introduced, H.R. 4811, the FHA Safety and Soundness and Taxpayer Protection Act. H.R. 4811, my bill, went further than the proposals put forth by the administration. My legislation included some additional enforcement, fiscal and risk-assessment tools necessary to adequately administer the program, detect fraud and abuse, strengthen underwriting standards, and protect the taxpayer. I appreciate Chairman FRANK and Chairwoman WATERS' willingness to include the additional provisions that were part of my bill which I believe made H.R. 5072 a stronger bill and one that is more able to address the pressing challenges before the FHA today.

I would also like to thank Secretary Donovan of HUD and Commissioner Stevens of the FHA for testifying before our committee, and also for working with me and my staff and the majority staff to formulate what I think is a very good bill.

The FHA was established by the National Housing Act of 1934 to broaden homeownership, protect lending institutions, and stimulate the building industry. I did not realize this, but prior to the creation of FHA, home mortgages did not exceed 50 percent of the home value and did not extend past the fifth year. At the end of 5 years, mortgages had to be either paid or renegotiated. But during the Great Depression, lenders were unable or unwilling to renegotiate many of the loans that came due. Consequently, many borrowers lost their homes and lenders lost money because property values declined significantly. The FHA program was established originally to provide stability and liquidity in the market. Its creation fostered the 30-year mortgage product and led to standardized mortgage instruments.

Once again, today, FHA has played an important role in a difficult housing market. As private sector lenders have scaled back their activities during the past 2 years, the FHA has significantly increased its share of the single-family mortgage market from less than 5 percent to more than 30 percent, but increased delinquencies and foreclosures across the Nation have had a detrimental effect on the financial health of the FHA program. An independent actuarial report which was published on November 12, 2009 showed that the capital reserve ratio for the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, the MMIF, dropped below the congressionally

mandated threshold of 2 percent to a less-than-expected .53 percent, a serious red flag. The actuarial review also indicated that the economic value of the FHA declined over 75 percent from last year to \$2.73 billion. In light of these facts, it is essential that Congress and the FHA enact reforms to ensure that a bailout of FHA is not and will not be necessary.

Madam Chair, the provisions of this bill are an important step in providing HUD with the tools it needs to supervise and monitor the FHA program and adequately assess risk. As the chairwoman has said, of the many important provisions included, H.R. 5072 authorizes FHA to increase annual insurance premiums and requires indemnification by lenders for loss on loans they originate.

The program is intended to be self-funded. Proceeds from the premiums paid by the homeowners for the FHA guarantee are used to operate the program and pay losses when loans default. The ability to increase annual premiums will allow HUD the ability to raise annual premiums above the .55 percent cap, which will allow FHA to more adequately price for risk and to build up its reserve ratio which, as we know, has fallen below its congressionally mandated level. The indemnification provisions in H.R. 5072 will give HUD the ability to seek restitution against unscrupulous lenders who make loans they never should have made.

H.R. 5072 is an important and necessary bill; it gives HUD the tools it needs to raise the annual premiums so that HUD can begin the process of putting the FHA program back on the road to a program that has an adequate reserve ratio and enough capital for the program to run in a safe and sound manner.

However, let me be clear: H.R. 5072 is not a panacea. The Department and this Congress and future Congresses must be ever vigilant in our oversight of this program to make certain that the program is operated in a way that assures the taxpayer is protected.

Recent reports indicate that FHA, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are responsible for 100 percent of today's new mortgage originations, which means that the exposure for the taxpayer continues to grow day by day. That is why it was and still is imperative that reform of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac be part of any attempt to fix our financial and regulatory system. Fannie and Freddie were a big part of what caused the financial collapse, and they must be part of the solution.

There are numerous issues currently being debated as part of the regulatory reform package such as risk retention, qualified mortgages, derivatives, hedge funds—and the list goes on—that could have significant implications for the future of the mortgage market as well as the direction of reform for Fannie and Freddie. H.R. 5072, the bill we are considering today, is extremely impor-

tant because it provides the administration with the ability to increase the premiums which will improve FHA's current financial situation and prevent the need for any taxpayer bailouts.

I urge my colleagues to fully support H.R. 5072.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee and the Housing Subcommittee, my friend, Mr. LEE, from New York.

Mr. LEE of New York. I thank my friend from West Virginia for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5072, the FHA Reform Act of 2010. This legislation before us today clearly takes important steps towards restoring stability into our housing market.

I share the frustration that I hear, though, from my constituents in western New York who have been responsible homeowners but who are increasingly paying the price for the fraud and abuse throughout our mortgage system. No one—no business and no person—should be able to take risks without having to accept the consequences.

We've all seen the consequences of the actions taken by irresponsible lending practices, and Congress has rightfully looked at outdated mortgage structures to ensure responsible homeowners have access to safe and affordable mortgages without forcing them to pay for the irresponsibility of others.

Earlier this year, I joined my friend from New Jersey (Mr. ADLER) in introducing H.R. 3146, the 21st Century FHA Housing Act, which took much of what we have learned from past FHA shortages to ensure they don't happen again. I am pleased that the bill before us today does this as well and includes many of the reforms that we proposed last year. H.R. 5072 will help ensure that FHA will be a stabilizing force in the market and support responsible homeownership for first-time buyers and underserved markets.

Given that FHA is now one of the primary facilitators of mortgage financing, it is absolutely necessary that we get this reform right. FHA must have the resources it needs to effectively oversee mortgages and ensure that no bad actors are allowed to function in the marketplace.

We need a responsive, efficient, and capable FHA to help ensure that owning a home remains part of the American Dream. I believe the bill before us today will help keep that dream alive. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chair, I would just reiterate that this bill has my support. It passed out of the committee by voice vote. I think we did a good job meeting each other halfway on certain issues that we might have had some disagreement on, and I look forward to the passage of this bill.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I would simply like to close by thanking Mrs. CAPITO for all of the work that she put

into this legislation and the cooperation that she gave to me and her staff to my staff.

This is a good bill. The differences have been worked out between both sides of the aisle. We worked hard to make sure that we maintained FHA, but that we keep a close watch on it; that, in fact, we give it flexibility, but at the same time ensure the continuity and the consistency of FHA that should be there to provide the guarantees for our citizens that so desperately need them.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I move that the Committee do now rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHIFF) having assumed the chair, Mrs. HALVORSON, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5072) to improve the financial safety and soundness of the FHA mortgage insurance program, had come to no resolution thereon.

BP AND NOAA NEED TO BETTER MONITOR OIL BENEATH THE OCEAN'S SURFACE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, officials admitted that a significant amount of oil may be spreading through the deep ocean in layers of highly dissolved oil. This revelation is anything but recent, except to BP.

Last month, I sent a letter, along with my colleagues in the Florida delegation, calling on the administration to examine the amounts of oil suspended in the water column below the ocean surface; yet until yesterday, officials failed to acknowledge what many in the scientific community were already saying, that underwater oil plumes are possible and that they pose a tremendous threat.

My congressional district is home to a variety of ecosystems—coral reefs, mangroves, sea grass beds, as well as countless species of fish. NOAA and BP must do a better job of examining the impact of crude oil and chemical dispersants at all depths of the ocean's surface. My constituents who rely on fishing, diving and tourism for their livelihood demand that we utilize all available resources. Get this right before the disaster becomes even worse.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4173.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1800

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STANDING BY ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Last week's interdiction by the Israeli Navy of a small flotilla of ships trying to run the blockade on Hamas-controlled Gaza ignited a firestorm around the world.

Foreign commentators, who look askance at the Jewish state in the best of times, condemned the raid in the strongest of terms, attempting to cast it as another example of Israel's supposed slide toward South African-style apartheid or even fascism.

Here and in Israel, itself, the reaction reflected a deeper understanding of the broad spectrum of threats confronting Israel. The execution of the raid, itself, was criticized in some quarters, but there remains a fundamental understanding of the underlying conditions that gave rise to Israel's blockade of Gaza and a realization that those conditions persist and that, as long as Gaza remains under the control of Hamas, there can be no lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

Hamas leaders and their masters in Tehran and Damascus have repeatedly refused to renounce terror, to abide by agreements signed by the Palestinian Authority and Israel and to recognize Israel's right to exist. They have used Gaza's impoverished population as human shields in their war of attrition with Israel and have subordinated their people's needs to the quest for rockets and other weapons. Two days ago, Israeli forces intercepted an armed squad of five terrorists who were wearing diving suits and who were apparently on their way to attack Israeli targets.

Madam Speaker, there can be no doubt that these are dangerous times for Israel and that America must stand by the Middle East's only democracy in its quest for peace and security.

Despite four rounds of U.N. sanctions, including today's passage of

tighter finance curbs and an expanded arms embargo, Iran has not been deterred in its quest to develop nuclear weapons. While this latest round of sanctions is a welcomed step, there is deep skepticism that President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the hard-line clerics who rule Iran can be dissuaded from their present course. An Iran armed with the bomb would be a catastrophe, destabilizing the Middle East and triggering an arms race in the region.

President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton have done a great service to Israel, to the greater Middle East, and to the cause of international peace and security through their efforts to forge a consensus in the Security Council, and I offer them my personal thanks. Yet, even as we applaud today's sanctions vote, we must redouble our efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and I look forward to further diplomatic and unilateral initiatives to convince Tehran that the costs of continuing on this reckless path are greater than any perceived benefit.

Hezbollah, the Shiite militia cum political party created in Lebanon by Iran's Revolutionary Guards in 1983, has rearmed in the aftermath of the 2006 war with Israel. Its arsenal of short-range missiles has reportedly been augmented by longer range Scuds, which can reach targets throughout Israel. The Scuds, believed to be supplied by Syria, augment Hezbollah's existing stockpile of up to 40,000 rockets stored in underground bunkers in southern Lebanon.

Turkey, which has been Israel's strongest Muslim majority ally and an important mediator between Jerusalem and Arab capitals, has, in recent months, become deeply hostile to Israel. In addition to hosting the organizers of the Gaza flotilla, Turkey has said it would reduce military and trade ties, and it has put off discussions of energy projects, including natural gas and freshwater shipments. Last year, Prime Minister Erdogan accused Israel of being a greater violator of human rights than Sudan, and today, Turkey was one of only two votes against new rounds of sanctions against Iran in the Security Council.

Most worrisome in the long term is the broad-based international campaign to delegitimize Israel. University campuses have been divided by divestment campaigns. There have been academic and economic boycotts of Israel in Europe, and many Israelis are wary of traveling to several European countries.

The great majority of the world's people alive today were not born until well after World War II and did not bear witness to the Holocaust. They did not watch as thousands of Jewish refugees, desperate to start new lives in Palestine after the war, were forcibly prevented from entering the country by Britain. They did not witness the miracle of Israel's birth in 1948 and

the immediate invasion of the new state by five Arab armies.

For more than six decades, this country has stood by Israel. We have admired its pluck, its ingenuity, and its dedication to democratic principles in spite of all of the threats it faces. While there has always been a strategic dimension to the U.S.-Israel alliance, the relationship has really been rooted in our shared values.

Madam Speaker, 17 years ago, on the occasion of the signing of the Oslo Accords, late Prime Minister Rabin spoke movingly of his journey.

He said, "We have come from Jerusalem, the ancient and eternal capital of the Jewish people. We have come from an anguished and grieving land. We have come from a people, a home, a family, that has not known a single year—not a single month—in which mothers have not wept for their sons. We have come to try and put an end to the hostilities so that our children and our children's children will no longer have to experience the painful cost of war, violence, and terror.

"We have come to secure their lives and to ease the sorrow and the painful memories of the past—to hope and pray for peace."

We share the prime minister's sorrow, and to the people of Israel, we say, America is with you.

PARADISE ISLAND FOR ILLEGALS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Sara Carter, at the Washington Examiner, reports the Mexican Government is opening up a satellite consular office on Catalina Island in California. It will be housed at the island's country club. Catalina Bay is a postcard picture of the lifestyles of the rich and famous, but the island has a long history of drug smuggling and human trafficking.

The consular's office is not there to help people come to the U.S. legally. Instead, the Mexican Government is giving out I.D. cards, called matricula cards, to illegals. These cards are used by illegals in the United States to get credit, to open bank accounts and—get this—to receive federally funded housing on the island.

The Mexican Government is an accomplice to the unlawful entry by these illegals. As further evidence of the willful arrogance of Mexico to violate and to ignore U.S. immigration laws, ICE officers said Mexican officials asked them to temporarily halt the enforcement of U.S. immigration laws on the island.

Isn't that special? Meanwhile, the invasion continues.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BALDWIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk tonight about, obviously, some of the issues that are on everybody's minds as to what happened last week with Israel.

This was a premeditated attack. It was intended to provoke a response and to purposely initiate a violent confrontation. We know that those on the flotilla had terrorist ties to Hamas and to Iran and that Israel warned the boats that they were in violation of a lawful blockade and offered them safe harbor, where all the humanitarian aid would be off-loaded and delivered to Gaza.

It is striking how quickly the world looked to blame Israel for this incident, but as the details have emerged, it has become clear that the Israeli military attempted to resolve the situation peacefully and in accordance with international law.

I fully support Israel and their right to keep its people safe. It is my sincere hope that this incident will not deter our country and the international community from the need to continue to support Israel, to recognize its right to exist, and to take the steps required to advance the peace process.

Israel is a longstanding ally and friend of the United States, and we should continue to do whatever we can to support Israel and to ensure that international challenges to its security are resolved quickly and peacefully.

These Israeli servicemembers were beaten and stabbed while trying to escort the ship to port. Those on board the ship were trying to help a recognized terrorist group, Hamas, and Iran has offered to escort future flotillas.

Iran is a threat, not just to the United States or to Israel, but to the world. It is a real threat against global safety. We cannot just sit and watch Iran stir this pot up anymore. Iran has vowed to eliminate Israel. We as the United States should stay together to make sure that Israel, the true democracy in the Middle East, has that opportunity to protect its land.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a terrible thing when there is loss of life, but it is more terrible when other democracies start to condemn another democracy. Israel has the right to protect itself and its citizens. We in the United States would have done the same thing. We in the United States have come back to protect our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the June 1, 2010, incident involving a Turkish-sponsored flotilla and the Israeli Defense Forces was a premeditated attack, intended to provoke a response and purposely initiate a violent confrontation. We

know that those on the flotilla had terrorist ties to Hamas and to Iran and that Israel warned the boats that they were in violation of a lawful blockade and offered them safe harbor, where all humanitarian aid would be off-loaded and delivered to Gaza. It is striking how quick the world looked to blame Israel for this incident but as the details have emerged, it has become clear that the Israeli military attempted to resolve the situation peacefully and in accordance with international law.

I fully support Israel and their right to keep its people safe. It is my sincere hope that this incident will not deter our country and the international community from the need to continue to support Israel, recognize its right to exist, and take the steps required to advance the peace process. Israel is a longstanding ally and friend of the United States and we should continue to do whatever we can to support Israel and ensure that intentional challenges to its security are resolved quickly and peacefully.

These Israeli service members were beaten and stabbed while just trying to escort the ship to port. Those on board the ship were trying to help a recognized terrorist group, Hamas. And Iran has offered to escort future flotillas. Iran is a threat not just to the United States or Israel but the world and is a real threat against global safety. We cannot just sit and watch Iran.

AQUINAS BASEBALL

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Aquinas High School baseball team for reaching their first-ever Class A State Championship series.

I am a proud graduate of St. Thomas Aquinas in Augusta, Georgia, and I played on the baseball team under Coach Denny Leonard, so I was particularly thrilled to hear of the success that they enjoyed this season.

Coach Mike Laney did a terrific job getting his team to the championship. Aquinas surpassed all expectations. They were not forecasted to make it past the second round of the tournament, so I know Coach Laney must be especially proud with the team's march to the State finals. The Fighting Irish took down Walker in a competitive three-game semifinal series and then advanced to the championship to face Wesleyan, the defending State champions.

They gave it all they had, but unfortunately, they came up a little short. Nevertheless, Aquinas has a very young team, so there is not a doubt in my mind that they will be back next year—even stronger and more competitive.

Congratulations on your hard work, accomplishments, and great season. Go, Irish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MORATORIUM ON OFFSHORE DRILLING IS THE SECOND DISASTER IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the moratorium on deepwater offshore drilling will prevent drilling in the Gulf of Mexico for the next 6 months or longer.

Why do we have the moratorium? What is the purpose?

When we have a plane crash, as disastrous as that might be, we don't close down the entire airline industry for 6 months—that wouldn't make sense—but now we want to close down the drilling offshore for 6 months.

What is the reason?

The 6-month moratorium on drilling will be another economic catastrophe for the United States. Six months is a long time in the drilling business. These wells can't start and stop overnight, and neither can the support industries.

Mr. Speaker, this chart right here shows the coasts of Texas and Louisiana, and on this chart, out in the Gulf of Mexico, there are about 4,000 offshore rigs. These 4,000 rigs will not be allowed to drill, based upon the administration's moratorium, for the next 6 months. All of these yellow dots represent a drilling rig that is offshore, and they go about 75 to 150 miles off the Texas-Louisiana coast, not counting those off of Mississippi and Alabama.

Some companies are already moving workers to Brazil and to the Middle East because of this absurdity of a moratorium. Texas and Louisiana will lose an estimated 20,000 to 30,000 jobs just in this industry, not counting all the related industries that are onshore. The people who supply those rigs—the food, the transportation, communications, goods and services—all of those jobs will be gone if these rigs are not allowed to drill. The longer the uncertainty continues here in America, the worse it will get, and there is no guarantee these jobs will ever come back. That is not only a threat to our economy. It is a threat to national security.

That means the United States will now import more oil from countries that don't like us—like the Middle East and Venezuela. Now China and

Russia, two of our buddies, are going to drill off the coast of Cuba with Venezuela and Vietnam.

Isn't that a lovely experience?

The loss of our domestic source of oil in the Gulf of Mexico will make us further dependent on foreign oil and will increase energy costs to all Americans, and that will also increase tanker traffic bringing that oil into the Gulf of Mexico. There have been 16 large international oil spills of over 30 million gallons, and only three of those have been from offshore drilling rigs. The rest have been from oil tankers bringing oil from one place to another. So we need to put a proactive plan in place so we can better deal with accidents in the Gulf of Mexico.

It took 9 days for the administration to make remarks about the impact of the Deepwater explosion and for DHS to declare the spill of national significance. There was no clear chain of command for who was in control of the disaster. There doesn't seem to be any plan. There should have been a plan in place immediately to respond. That's the government's responsibility. Some say it was the Coast Guard's. Others say it was the EPA's. It is still somewhat of a mystery as to who was supposed to be in charge and who was supposed to be in control of the cleanup and of the containment when the explosion occurred.

It took 37 days to attempt the top-kill procedure. Why so long? We don't know the answer yet. The majority of the pollution is a result of the delay, not of the explosion. I repeat: The majority of the pollution is the result of the delay and not of the explosion itself.

□ 1815

Now government is overreacting to the aftermath and making the economic impact worse by prohibiting the drilling of these other 4,000 wells. The moratorium could end up being a worse economic problem than the accident itself. It's the second disaster now in the Gulf of Mexico.

The EPA was created in 1970 to address industrial pollution, and they have somewhat of a history of overreacting and overregulating. And the bottom line is they are driving and have driven American manufacturing jobs to other countries. We cannot allow this to happen again with offshore drilling.

As much as we need to use all alternative sources of energy, right now our economy runs on fossil fuels, and that's not going to really change anytime soon. So we either have to import more oil or we have to allow these rigs to drill.

America doesn't yet run on windmills and moonbeams. We need a plan for future disasters, to include who is in charge of stopping the leak, who is in charge of containment of the oil spill, and who is in charge of the cleanup. As of today, there does not seem to be a comprehensive plan to implement.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of speaking by telephone with one of the most important and respected leaders of the pro-democracy movement inside Cuba, Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, "Antunez," from his house in the town of Placetas in the province of Villa Clara.

I always learn when I speak to Antunez. He conveyed to me some facts that I think should be known by my colleagues.

Fact: There are not 200 political prisoners in Cuba; there are thousands of political prisoners in Cuba. As Amnesty International has recently admitted in one of its published reports, the dictatorship uses criminal penal charges and sentences for so-called crimes, such as contempt against authority and dangerousness—criminal charges to deny, to hide the status, the political status, of prisoners of conscience.

Fact: Various pro-democracy leaders and political prisoners are on hunger strikes, as we speak, in Cuba. Most well-known is the hunger strike being carried out by the peaceful pro-democracy leader Guillermo Farinas, a psychologist and journalist who demands the release of the 25 most gravely ill prisoners of conscience to their homes.

But there are others also engaged in hunger strikes at the moment, and their heroic efforts need to be known as well. Guillermo del Sol Perez, a former political prisoner, is on a hunger strike in Santa Clara. And the following current political prisoners are engaged in hunger strikes at this moment: Egberto Angel Escobedo Morales, Mario Alberto Perez Aguilera, and Ernesto Mederos Arrozarena.

Fact: There are many political prisoners who are gravely ill and, yet, have not been included on any of the lists that have been made public—for example, Armando Sosa Fortuny and Cecilio Reinoso Sanchez.

Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, "Antunez," is a great leader and one of my heroes.

Before being released from prison in 2007, he spent 17 years as a political prisoner due to his peaceful advocacy for democracy in Cuba.

He and his wife, also photographed here, Iris Perez Aguilera, have been detained, harassed, spat upon, and beaten innumerable times since his release in 2007 from prison. But Antunez never gives up. He told me this morning he has a new blog, “Ni me callo, ni me voy”—“I won’t shut up, I won’t leave.”

I not only learn, Mr. Speaker, when I am able to speak with Antunez, I receive strength from his courage, patriotism, and devotion to the struggle for Cuba’s freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. RICHARDSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DESTRUCTION AND DEVASTATION IN THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember the five lives of five constituents from my district who were killed this past weekend as a severe thunderstorm which produced two tornados swept across my district, leaving a trail of absolute destruction and devastation.

Mary Walters and her 4-year-old son, Hayden, in addition to Ted Kranz, Kathy Hammitt, and Bailey Bowman, all died during the storm.

On Sunday I rode with the Fulton County sheriff, and on Monday I rode with the Lake Township, Wood County chief of police to get a firsthand view of the devastation left behind by these tornados. During these visits, I spoke with many residents who survived the storms and heard them relate their miracle tales of survival.

I also want to recognize the 2010 graduating class of Lake High School in Wood County for their steadfast will and character in the wake of this deadly storm. One of the tornadoes hit Lake High School, completely destroying the school. This happened only hours before the senior class of 110 students were scheduled to hold their commencement ceremony Sunday afternoon. And, sadly, the class valedictorian, Katie Kranz, lost her father during that storm.

The true character, compassion, and strength of the people of America come

through in times like these, as the surrounding communities have stepped up to help in whatever way possible during the recovery effort. The local chapter of the Red Cross and other volunteer organizations were quickly on the ground to lend their support.

The local elected officials and administrators of Wood and Fulton Counties should also be commended for their organization and leadership during these trying times. Their quick response to help those in need has held the community together during this time.

I also want to commend other communities in the area, like the city of Northwood, who helped by letting the Lake Township Police use its communications headquarters after the Lake Township Police Department was destroyed, as well as the administration building.

The city of Oregon has lent three police cruisers to the township, as well as the Wood County sheriff lending two. Why? Because the Lake Township lost six of their cars during the storm.

Yesterday I sent a letter to President Obama requesting that Wood and Fulton Counties be declared Federal disaster areas as soon as possible. This will be important for the counties so that they may have access to as many resources as possible during the recovery efforts.

This afternoon, Governor Strickland is also asking for a declaration for Federal assistance, and I thank him for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LEGACY OF COACH KENNETH CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, after 49 years of dedicated service to the Marietta community, Coach Kenneth Carter is retiring from his position with the Physical Education and Health Department and as a tennis coach for Marietta High School.

Coach Carter has been a dedicated educator and a role model for sports teams in the Marietta school district for as long as I can remember. He has coached football, basketball, track, and, most memorably, tennis, where he had a record of 16 consecutive wins, one State championship, and nine region championships.

He received the Georgia Tennis Coach of the Year award and also was inducted with the 1985 tennis team into the Marietta High School Hall of Fame.

Prior to his career with Marietta City Schools, Ken Carter worked for

the Atlanta YMCA, teaching and training children. He drove a bus back and forth from the Y, making sure that underprivileged kids had access to the facility. Coach Carter has always said that behavior is the number-one problem with youths, and the training he gave at the YMCA taught kids how to be both good athletes and good people.

It was here that Coach Carter met the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. King went to the YMCA often to swim, and Carter would listen to his stories about civil rights issues. Coach Carter says working with King was a source of personal inspiration and many life lessons.

Coach Carter has also been very active with his church and served as the superintendent of Sunday School for 22 years.

His dedication and selfless attitude are well-known, as Coach Carter has been recognized as the Outstanding Man of the Year, Teacher of the Year, and has also received an Outstanding Service Award.

Congratulations, Coach Carter, on your retirement, and thank you for everything you have given to Marietta’s school system.

TAKING A CLOSER LOOK AT THE GAZA FLOTILLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Israeli military personnel intercepted a flotilla of ships headed towards Gaza. The world outcry has been deafening. It has also been misplaced.

The Israelis have been portrayed as committing violence in order to prevent food and humanitarian supplies from reaching women and children in the crowded Palestinian community of Gaza.

Yes, that would certainly be an outrage if that is what was going on. But the actions taken by Israel are aimed only at preventing rockets from being shot into Israel, not denying food or medicine to the Palestinians. The image in the public’s mind is totally distorted. And what the world needs to do is take a closer look at what is being presented to them.

Even Al Jazeera, the most prominent Arabic TV news station, could not block out the reality of so-called activists, peace activists, who were really thugs, attacking Israeli soldiers with lead pipes and clubs. The soldiers are seen refraining from using their weapons as they watch fellow troopers being beaten into a bloody pulp and lying on the ground, their lives in danger.

Well, who first initiated violence, the violence that we are talking about, is not in question. Even Al Jazeera could not hide that fact. Yet, photos of the wounded and dead who ended up—and these were wounded and dead activists, after they had started beating to death

the Israeli soldiers and, thus, force was being used in order to protect these soldiers' lives—well, only these pictures of wounded and dead so-called peace activists were highlighted in reports of this incident.

This distortion is intended to deceive the people of the world. The so-called activists created the violence that erupted when the flotilla was intercepted for inspection.

Now, apologists will simply say that those pipe-wielding thugs were justified because the Israelis should never have stopped and interdicted those ships aimed at giving humanitarian supplies to the people of Gaza. Well, why was that inspection necessary? Never stop asking that basic question. Why was it necessary for that inspection?

They weren't stopping the supplies; they were simply inspecting the cargo. Why are the Israelis insisting on inspecting the ships going to Gaza? Because Palestinian territory is being used to launch thousands of rockets and artillery at civilian communities in Israel from Gaza.

Now, the purpose of the flotilla was not to put food and humanitarian aid in the hands of the Palestinian women and children. That would have happened anyway because the Israelis, they just wanted to inspect this and then let that food and humanitarian supplies go forward.

No, that wasn't the purpose. The purpose of the flotilla was to prevent Israel from stopping the missile attacks on Israeli women and children by preventing Israel from interdicting weapons shipments into Gaza with the humanitarian aid as a cover.

No. These missile attacks from Gaza are, by anybody's definition, a terrorist attack. If the Palestinians want food and humanitarian supplies, end the rocket attacks.

□ 1830

Israel would be very happy if that happened, to let any food and humanitarian aid go into Gaza. And this is not an unreasonable demand on the part of the Israelis to at least inspect the cargoes in order to ensure that they are not being used to cover up the shipment of weapons that are being used to kill Israeli citizens. If you are launching explosive projectiles into Israel, Israel has a right to look at what you are shipping into your country to make sure you are not shipping in those items that are necessary to shoot these things into Israel and kill women and children.

So in reality, the so-called peace activists were not victims at all. They were belligerent, they were hostile, they were seeking more killing in the form of not only just killing these Israeli soldiers trying to inspect their ships, but killing more Israeli civilians through rocket attacks. They also, of course, are not just killing innocent people; they are undermining any chance for peace and reconciliation be-

tween the Palestinian people and the Israeli people.

No, those so-called peace activists were the villains in this situation, and those Israeli troopers who tried to at least inspect it to see that rockets were not being smuggled in, they were the heroes of the day. The world needs to seek truth in this issue and ignore the distorted picture they are being presented.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

THE ISRAELI BLOCKADE AND THE FLOTILLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order that I and Leader HOYER will be convening for the following hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, in the overnight hours of May 31, about 10 days ago, news broke that we now have become very familiar with—the previous speaker referred to it, and several of my colleagues have come to the floor this evening to talk about it—where a flotilla coming from Turkey was intercepted as part of the effort of the State of Israel to defend a blockade that was set up.

I want to spend the next hour talking a little bit about that boat and how it progressed, where it came from and why, and perhaps importantly drill into a little bit the idea of what the blockade is all about and what the history was. It is impossible to fully understand this issue only looking at it from the point of Israeli naval officers climbing on board a ship and saying, okay, I think I understand the story because I see that picture. That would no more be the truth than to watch the closing scene of Casablanca and say, okay, I understand what happened in this movie.

This was indeed a tragic thing. Anytime there is loss of life, anytime you have military officers, commandos climbing on a boat, something has broken down, something has failed. But what I don't think is fully understood, and still to this day isn't understood at capitals around the world, is who initiated this thing and why it was initiated.

Make no mistake about it, my colleagues, as Leader HOYER will be mentioning when he arrives here shortly, the condemnation that rang around the world against Israel is almost a default position in European and Arab capitals of the world. There is almost no surprise. It is also true that those very same quarters are the ones that criticize the United States at just about any opportunity. And in many of those same places you also see far too much joyous chest beating anytime something like this goes down where the United States or Israel is involved.

It was undoubtedly unfortunate that it occurred, but it didn't happen by accident. If you look at the history of this incident, it actually started not on May 31, when the sailors climbed aboard that boat, but it started on May 17, a couple of weeks earlier. What happened then? What happened then was the Israeli Government got wind of the idea that this flotilla was leaving from Cyprus, Turkey, and said, look, understand that there is a blockade around Gaza that controls what can get inside of Gaza for obvious reasons that I will go into further later. But, frankly, to stop weapons from going into Gaza, because it is weapons and missiles that have come into the Gaza Strip, which is controlled by the terrorist organization Hamas, that have been used to terrorize Israelis. Terrorize to the magnitude of about 10,000 rockets have left from Gaza since Israel left it in 2007 and Gaza was controlled by Hamas.

So they say we have an internationally recognized blockade that's been supported by both the Bush and Obama administrations to prevent ships from coming in without their having their goods inspected. So what the Israeli Government did is they reached out internationally to the sponsors of this boat and to the people on the boat and said, look, you are welcome to bring your supplies here to Gaza.

So it was on May 31 that this boat was intercepted off the coast of Gaza, but it was May 17 that Israel said, look, if you are interested in bringing humanitarian aid to Gaza, you are welcome to do it. All you have to do is bring it into Ashdod, which is right here, and we will look at the goods, make sure there is nothing dangerous in there, and then we will allow it to be escorted into Gaza via truck.

That's not an unusual occurrence. In fact, as of this morning 11,972 trucks during this period of time the blockade has been in effect have been escorted in just such a way. It's not unusual for humanitarian aid to come into Gaza. Despite much of the rhetoric we have heard from the international community, Israel facilitates it through a process.

Now, the people on those boats, this humanitarian boat that theoretically was trying to bring humanitarian aid to Gaza, said, no, we are going to take this flotilla of boats and we are going to go into the teeth of this blockade. They were reportedly warned repeatedly, and no one has disputed that.

They were warned, look, a blockade is essentially a military thing.

It is the same type of thing that we used in our blockade of Cuba. It is a recognized blockade. Because if you think about it, there aren't a lot of ways—if you look at the map here, this little stretch of land is what we are talking about. It borders Israel on some sides. Egypt, which is a participant in the blockade, they support and help support the blockade that Israel has. This huge coast here has been used in the past, particularly by the nation of Iran, to import weapons in.

But instead, this humanitarian ship, which was no humanitarian ship as we later learned, this humanitarian ship, said, no, we are going to keep going. Now, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, none of us are naval officers in this Chamber. Actually, Congressman SESTAK is a naval officer, and I don't see him here today. But when it comes to enforcing a blockade, you don't have a lot of tools in your quiver.

Now, there are some ways that you can debilitate a boat, that you can stop its rotors from turning by essentially jamming it up from waters underneath. That was done with one, two, three, four, five of the other boats that you didn't hear about in the newspaper. But those boats were stopped using the efforts of the military in Israel to stop them in the most peaceful way possible.

Now, if a boat is coming into a blockade and it might pose a threat to Israel or to the United States, I mean, you can very easily change the names of the country and say a boat was coming from Yemen to the United States, and it's coming in and it wants to cruise down into the East River. Of course the United States would not let that happen, and the Coast Guard would say you are going to stop right here so we can inspect what's on this boat. And if they kept going, certainly we would not say, oh, that's okay. Every step necessary would be taken to stop them.

Well, that's kind of what happened here. What effectively happened was this boat said we are not going to stop, and they said we are going to leave the Israelis with no opportunity except to board the boat. That's what created the conflict. Israel did not create the conflict. They were essentially in a defensive posture, saying this is the line, don't cross it; and we are going to give you every opportunity before you reach the line to avert this conflict. The people on the boat chose not to. They wanted this conflict. They wanted this conflict. They did not want to deliver humanitarian aid; they wanted this conflict.

Well, once the conflict was upon the Israelis, I think by just about any definition of restraint the Israelis used restraint. They climbed aboard with quite literally paint guns on their shoulders to use when they landed. The only arms that they had were sidearms for the personal protection of these guys. And when they lowered them-

selves down on the boat, they were set upon by these humanitarian peace activists, I say with my tongue firmly in cheek. They were set upon with knives. They were set upon with steel poles. They were set upon with bullets. There were magazines and casings on the boat that did not match any of the Israeli sidearms. It was tragic that that happened. It was sad that it happened. But it was almost entirely the decision of the people on that boat.

Now, I say almost entirely, because that boat did not just appear out of the ether. It didn't just appear out of thin air. It had an enormous amount of support by some of the worst enemies of peace in that region, and some of the worst enemies, quite literally, not only of Israel, but of the United States as well. And I mean Turkey, Iran, Hamas. These are not entities that were looking for some peaceful resolution here.

Remember, once again to reiterate, here in the Gaza Strip, when elections were held in Israel, Israel does not any longer occupy the West Bank or Gaza. They left. They left it to the Palestinian people. This part here, the West Bank, is run by the Palestinian Authority.

Many of my colleagues know Mahmoud Abbas was here in Washington today and met with the President. This is a place that's had a great deal of economic growth. There has been a reduction in the amount of violence coming out of the West Bank. There are still problems, and I still think it is outrageous we provide any aid to the West Bank or Gaza so long as Mahmoud Abbas refuses to engage in direct negotiations for peace.

But putting that aside for a moment, in this area here, not the Palestinian Authority or Fatah, but Hamas, the terrorist organization Hamas that is funded by Iran, that gets their weapons from Iran and is in a declared state of war with Israel, has said they don't support a two-state solution, they support a no-State of Israel solution.

Now, who is it that has been supporting that? Actually, it's not Egypt here. They have been working very hard to enforce the border that they have here and help to enforce the embargo. But it's basically Iran. Iran has been exporting terror here, not only here, by the way, but also up here to Hezbollah, to Nasrallah in Lebanon through their agent Syria. But that is why the blockade exists. It's not just because Israel wants conflict. Quite the opposite: it's to try to prevent essentially a war going on here with more and more rockets and more and more armaments coming on shore.

So when this embargo is enforced, it's not only protecting the people of Israel; it's protecting the United States, because this is a way that Iran wants to set up essentially what is an agent of their own in the Middle East. That's what they want.

So when the Israelis boarded the boat, they were set upon. The sailors were beaten. They were stabbed and

shot, as I said. And when the dust settled, we had an opportunity, as all the world did, to see what was on that boat.

Let me tell you what the humanitarian aid was that was on that boat: 100 units of metal rods of various length—well, I am sure that was going to feed a lot of children; 200 knives of various sizes; 150 military-style and Turkish-produced self-defense vests, military-style; seven electric saws; 100 pipe wrenches; 50 wooden clubs; 20 axes; a telescopic sight for a gun; four night vision goggles; 100 diving lights; 150 head lamps; and of course boxes and boxes of propaganda and tapes, all of them in Turkish.

Now, if there was a true interest on the part of this boat of providing food or aid to the people of Gaza, I believe they had an opportunity, obviously, to go to Ashdod and drive it in. They did not want that.

So what is the correct response of the United States and the world community when confronted with these facts? Well, we have a couple of things. First of all, we should understand that even if we are the last country on Earth that understands the facts that I have been laying out here, even if we are the last country on Earth that understands the importance of Israel's role in the region and how they are set upon in a similar way that the United States was on September 11, except the difference is they have that every day, we should stand with Israel. Even if we are the last country on Earth saying it, we should say, look, the facts are the facts here.

As much as we would like to say Turkey is a player for peace here, no, they were a player for war here. And as much as we might like to say you know what, boy, I wish everyone would just get along in that region, it's Israel who is now sitting at the bargaining table for peace and the Palestinians who are refusing to do so.

□ 1845

But I think, my colleagues, we also have to consider something else, and that is all our relationships with some of the players who are behind us. Let's consider Turkey. This would not have happened were it not for the nation of Turkey taking the role that they did. They funded the ship. They provided international cover. The Turkish Foundation for Human Rights and Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief, IHH as it's known in Turkey, has been linked to Hamas, and they helped to fund this. The Turkish Government just today voted against sanctions on Iran because, hey, this is apparently an agent, a country that they would like to be an agent for.

And for a lot of time, we kind of worship at the altar of the moderate Muslim state, the moderate Arab states that, you know what, we hope that they are there to be a fulcrum for peace, but it's not unlike a child wanting to see a unicorn. It would be great

if it happened, but we have to realize the facts are the facts, and NATO membership for Turkey has to be called into question here. We have to start to say to ourselves whose side is Turkey really going to be on, because what they did here is, rather than being an instrument for peace where they could have very easily said, We're sponsoring this boat. Go to Ashdod right here and offload the humanitarian aid. Or, We're sponsoring this boat. We're not going to have cases of knives on board. We're going to have cases of baby food because we want to help the people of Gaza.

That hasn't happened. And we also have to realize something else, and then I want to yield to some of my colleagues who have joined me.

We have to realize that the default position of Europe and the Arab capitals of the world is always going to be against Israel. We can't allow that and that alone to be the determinant of whether or not, of how our foreign policy is prosecuted. There's a terrorist state that controls Gaza right now. It's a terrorist state that, if they could, they would destroy the United States of America tomorrow, and they're starting with Israel.

The gentleman from Connecticut has been a great leader on this issue. I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. HIMES. I thank the gentleman from New York for his eloquent treatment of the facts, and I thank him for focusing on the facts at hand.

One of the most disheartening aspects of the flotilla situation was the extent to which the facts were initially set aside by much of the world, and instead, prejudice was allowed to emerge, a prejudice against our ally, Israel. And we subsequently learned, of course, that the facts are a good deal more complicated than perhaps we were led to believe initially. As my colleague from New York points out, this was a flotilla with more than one agenda, a flotilla with a clear intention of provoking the kind of response that was ultimately provoked. And make no mistake, there's not a person in this Chamber or anywhere else that isn't saddened by the loss of life in the Mediterranean.

But I'd like to step back for a moment, away from the immediate facts that Mr. WEINER did such a good job at articulating, to some larger issues that cannot be lost in the week-to-week, the day-to-day of our relationship with the State of Israel.

The best way I can encapsulate what I'm talking about here is that Israel, for the United States, is family. We speak of a special relationship with Great Britain. We have at least a special relationship with the nation of Israel. It is a relationship of family. In some cases, very literally. In other cases, and for this Nation as a whole, we are family because we share so many values, so many of these values that are incorporated into this building, into our constitutive documents,

our Judeo-Christian values, to which we owe a debt of obligation to Israel. And, of course, it is the only democracy in a very, very dangerous region. For that reason alone, we would resonate with the State of Israel. And, of course, something that is all too often forgotten, the economic ties that we have, the economic similarities, economies based on innovation and creativity.

All three of these things make Israel family, and we can't lose sight of this as the facts are outed. As investigations are undertaken, we can't lose track of that underlying fact, especially in a world where our family is at risk—and this room is full of fathers and mothers, and we know what that phrase means.

I traveled to Israel last summer, and I stood at Sderot and saw how close and how severe the risks of Hamas, an entity dedicated to the destruction of the State of Israel, how that is not abstract. In fact, that is barely an arm's length away from the State of Israel. To the north, of course, Hezbollah, another entity, sponsored by Iran, dedicated to the eradication of the State of Israel. And, of course, Iran itself, not far away and hell bent on the creation of weapons of mass destruction and leaving absolutely no ambiguity about what it would do with those weapons of mass destruction.

I'm not saying that any of that changes the facts that my colleague from New York has laid on the table that will be investigated, that will be considered, that will probably be most interestingly and comprehensively investigated by Israel herself. But we cannot, any more than we lose loyalty to our sons and daughters, our cousins, our brothers and sisters and our spouses, forget that we are talking about family, and that when family is at risk, we lean in to our family, and we remind the world that there is a reason why Israel is part of our family—a reason of values, a reason of democracy, and the reason that we stand here today to remind the world that Israel is our family.

Mr. WEINER. I appreciate his thoughts and his leadership on this.

Just to put it in further context of the relationship between the United States and Israel, this is a tiny town of Sderot that you mentioned in your remarks. In the period of time since Gaza has been controlled by Hamas, there have been 6,066 rockets fired from that area into Sderot, 4,434 mortars. And I ask my colleagues to envision your town, envision the district that you represent, envision this city being under that type of barrage from a specific place. Do you think a blockade would be an excessive step to take? And that's why it's so important that we stand here today, and it's particularly important that Leader HOYER asked us to gather today to make these points.

And before I yield to anyone else, I want to yield to the majority leader of

the House of Representatives, STENY HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding. I thank my friend for leading this effort at my request, and I thank those who have joined in in raising our voice to defend actions that really need no defense, actions that any nation on Earth would take if it were similarly threatened, any nation on Earth.

Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of Monday, May 31, Israel naval forces intercepted six ships carrying mostly Turkish demonstrators attempting to break the blockade of the Gaza Strip. There was no confusion. That's what they said they were going to do. Israel gave them notice 2 weeks prior to this that they would not allow that to happen. So there was no confusion here about what was happening.

Five of the six ships complied with the IDF requests. The largest of them, however, the Mavi Marmara, refused, clearly bent on violent confrontation as it was boarded by Israeli defense forces, as they knew they would be. There was no confusion. These IDF troops were violently attacked with knives, clubs, and other weapons.

Let me remind you that in five of the six in this flotilla there was no violence. There was something in common on all of those ships. IDF forces were on all of those ships. But five of those ships, knowing full well that the blockade would not be allowed to be breached, offered no violent resistance.

At the end of the skirmish on the Marmara, seven members of the IDF had suffered injuries, including gunshot wounds and head trauma, and nine demonstrators, tragically, on the Mavi Marmara had been killed. No one wanted that result. I think not even those who were committing the violence on the IDF forces wanted that. But once violence is initiated, one cannot predict the outcome.

Those deaths are tragic. The events leading up to them deserve a full and scrupulous investigation. But this much, ladies and gentlemen, is clear. To call all the passengers of the Mavi Marmara nonviolent peace activists would be a victory for propaganda, not for fact. Peace activists don't launch attacks with knives and guns, and they certainly don't do so while chanting slogans calling for the death of Jews as an al Jazeera broadcast showed. Not an Israeli broadcast, but an Al-Jazeera broadcast showed the chants from those ships, from this ship, Kill the Jews.

However much we lament those nine deaths—and we do so—the fact is that the IDF was faced with an organized, violent assault and responded in self-defense, as we would expect any of our own forces to do wherever they may be sent to defend our country. Unfortunately, but not unsurprisingly, this incident has renewed international condemnation for Israel's blockade of Gaza from countries I suggest to my colleagues that would do exactly the same thing.

I cannot believe there's a country in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in South America, or on the North American continent that would not say, If you breach this blockade that we have in place for our own security, we will confront you and stop you.

But that blockade exists for a reason: to keep weapons out of the hands of Hamas, a terrorist organization dedicated to the destruction of Israel and to random attacks on Israeli civilians.

Mr. WEINER has been pointing out the map. Probably most of us on this floor who are going to speak have been to Sderot. Some of us have been in the gymnasium that is an armed camp where it is the only safe place for the children of Sderot to play. Some have been with me to Sderot.

The attack on Israeli civilians has continued without abatement. I don't mean that it hasn't lessened from time to time, but never has there been a time when Israelis felt that the violence was concluded, because Hamas has made it clear that it will not conclude.

Hamas is dedicated to the destruction of Israel and to random attacks on Israeli civilians. The blockade was launched with the cooperation of Israel's neighbor Egypt when Hamas staged a violent coup to expel its political rivals and seize total control of Gaza. Who were its political rivals? Palestinians. The elected leadership of the Palestinian Authority.

And the blockade could end today, my friends, if Hamas recognized Israel's right to exist—as is the principle of the United Nations—gave up its commitment to murdering civilians, and released the Israeli soldier it holds captive.

To the extent that life is hard for those in Gaza, the prime cause is the terrorist organization that keeps them hostage, holds power through violence, and monopolizes the food and humanitarian supplies that Israel allows across the border.

Indeed, ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues, pay close attention to this point. Indeed, it is Hamas, not Israel, that is currently preventing the humanitarian goods from this very flotilla from reaching the Palestinians in Gaza. Not the blockade, but Hamas.

Finally, the United States should and will resist all one-sided attempts to condemn Israel at the United Nations. The UN, a body committed by its charter to universal human rights, has for much of its history, unfortunately, been sadly fixated on singling Israel out for condemnation—the only democratic nation in that region of the world that recognizes human rights. And we see the Supreme Court of Israel saying, time after time, you cannot do that government. That is a nation of laws. Yet it has been singled out for condemnation as much more serious crimes and crises have gone unaddressed throughout the world.

The biased record extends beyond the infamous 1975 resolution equating Zi-

onism with racism. The U.N. General Assembly has convened an emergency special session 10 times. Not, I would suggest to you, when the North Koreans killed, obviously premeditatedly, 46 individuals in their ship of South Korea in South Korean borders.

□ 1900

Six of the times that they met out of 10 have focused on one small besieged nation, Israel, while no emergency session was ever held on the Rwandan genocide, not held on the ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, not held on the genocide in Sudan.

The 2001 U.N. World Conference Against Racism neglected racism around the world to again single out, almost exclusively, Israel and Zionism. The U.N. Human Rights Council, whose members include Saudi Arabia, China, and Cuba, has only one permanent topic on its official agenda. Now, I have mentioned three genocides that have occurred. They are not on that agenda. Israel. Even Secretary-General Kofi Annan criticized the Human Rights Council for its "disproportionate focus on violations by Israel."

Should Israel comply with international law and the mores and values of the international community? Yes. Does it? Yes, yes, it does. And like every Nation, however, it enjoys the right to self-defense.

This troubled history is exactly why I'm skeptical that the United Nations will treat Israel justly now. What happened on Mavi Marmara needs a real investigation, not one colored by years of one-sided bias.

Mr. Speaker, despite what happened last Monday, the fundamentals of this conflict remain just as they were the day before. The overwhelming majority of Israelis want to live in peace with the Palestinians side-by-side in two States. So I believe do most Palestinians, but the extremism and hate of groups like Hamas stands in the way.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, there were those on those ships who sought this confrontation. Again, not for the purposes of humanitarian relief but for propaganda and for putting Israel at risk from those who wish its destruction. It is not a secret wish. It is an articulated wish. All the world knows the intent of Hamas: to destroy Israel and remove Jews from the Middle East because they say so.

Let us not be confused, Mr. Speaker. Finding a way to peace is fiercely difficult. It should not be made more difficult by those who see more propaganda value than human values and these loss of lives.

I thank my friend from New York for leading this Special Order that is so important so that our voices are heard here and around the world as it relates to our commitment to the sovereignty, security, and safety of Israel.

Mr. WEINER. Well, I thank you, and before the majority leader leaves the floor, I think on behalf of all of us in this institution, long before you were

the majority leader here, it was hard to think of a Member of the United States Congress in maybe anytime in the 62-year history of Israel that has had a stronger sense of commitment to the U.S.-Israel relationship than you, whether it was leading this body in a condemnation of the Goldstone Report, a one-sided document produced by the United Nations; leading this institution in support for Israel and, in fact, for the United States during the Gaza war.

It is important, that final note that you made about who Hamas is, they are an enemy of Israel for sure, but they're also an outpost for Iran. We have something very strong in common with Israel beyond just our common sense of democracy and culture. We have the common enemy that when this boat was traveling, it was traveling essentially doing the bidding of Iran, and we have to recognize that Israel is on the front line of what is essentially a threat to us.

I want to thank you on behalf of all of us who fight all the time to keep that Israel-United States relationship close for all that you have done in leading this institution.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for his comments and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. WEINER. It is also important that we recognize something else that the majority leader said about the use of human shields on that boat. There were probably some people on that boat who were completely without malice; although most of the loudest voices made it very clear that all of them that we heard seemed to want nothing more than conflict and more than having Israel wiped from the face of the Earth. But remember, when there was the war in Gaza, when there was the war in Lebanon, the one thing consistent about agents of Iran that they always do, these terrorist organizations, they're always using human shields. They're putting civilians and putting weapons in the neighborhoods of civilians all the time.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MAFFEI. I thank the gentleman from New York. I also thank the gentleman from Florida for his graciousness.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address exactly what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) was talking about and, that is, Iran's involvement and what we can do about it. Indeed, it has been since 2007 that Israel, along with Egypt, has instituted this blockade of the Gaza strip to stop individuals from smuggling weapons, and over the course of the blockade, as we have already talked about, Israeli defense forces have diverted numerous ships, all without incident. Nobody ever wishes for fatalities or injuries to occur during the enforcement of a blockade, but the fundamental thing to understand is that Israel has the same right to self-defense as any country.

Days before the incident, Israel notified Turkey and other governments participating that it would not allow flotillas to breach the blockade at Gaza, and as Mr. WEINER indicated at the beginning of this hour, humanitarian aid was allowed to be off-loaded in the Port of Ashdod.

I am confident that the Israeli government will conduct a full and credible investigation regarding this incident, and it is imperative that we draw on the special relationship that endures between the United States and Israel and continue to stand by our ally.

But I'm even more concerned that the media circus surrounding this incident may distract us from the real threat that Iran continues to pose, not just to Israel, not even just to its neighbors, but to the entire world, including the United States. The blockade was largely due to Iran's continued efforts to smuggle weapons, and we must keep an eye on that.

Now, in fact, the U.N. Security Council actually passed a resolution today, Resolution 1929, which imposes new sanctions against Iran because of its suspected nuclear weapon program, the Revolutionary Guard, ballistic missiles, and nuclear-related investments. The resolution does expand on three previous sanctions on Iran by strengthening and expanding existing measures and breaking ground in several new areas.

What the majority leader said about the United Nations is correct. We must always be somewhat skeptical about their resolutions. So the fact that even the United Nations is now passing this resolution should indicate a strong message about how dangerous Iran continues to be.

It is increasingly important that the United States stand with the State of Israel and impose even stronger sanctions than the U.N. has. A nuclear-capable Iran poses a major threat to the entire world. By combining a nuclear weapon with a current missile program, Tehran would be capable of targeting American troops and its allies throughout the Middle East and beyond.

Iran is one of the leading sponsors of terrorism and continues to spout anti-Semitic rhetoric regarding the State of Israel. President Obama has stated all options should remain on the table for dealing with Iran. However, currently tough sanctions that are strictly enforced remain the best option to try to persuade Iran's leaders to do away with their nuclear program.

Both Chambers of the 111th Congress have already passed Iran sanctions legislation. Currently, the conference committee has been working on reconciling these different bills. The legislation would increase pressure on Iran by restricting their ability to purchase or refine petroleum products. Despite being one of the largest producers of crude oil in the world, Iran lacks adequate refining capability to meet its own domestic needs for gasoline.

I believe only a consistent and appropriately tough sanctions policy will give the level of pressure on the current despotic State of Iran that has any chance of persuading Iran to drop its nuclear ambitions. The refusal of Iran to accept the existence of the State of Israel helped lead to the unrest in Gaza which helped lead to this incident.

The U.N. Security Council resolution is a good step, but America has an obligation to lead and not just follow.

I really thank the gentleman from New York for his indulgence.

Mr. WEINER. I thank you. The gentleman from Florida, I would be glad to yield to you.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you very much.

The question that has been raised by critics of Israel for the past week is why is Israel intercepting ships on the so-called high seas, 100 miles from its own shores, and the answer can be summed up in one simple phrase: self-defense. That simple phrase explains what we saw and explains Israel's continuing need to protect itself.

Over 1,000 rockets have been fired from Gaza into the territory of Israel, 1,000 rockets. Imagine what we would do if 1,000 rockets were fired into San Diego. Imagine what we would do if 1,000 rockets were fired into Seattle or into Detroit or any other border area.

In the case of Israel, 1 million people live within rocket range of Gaza, and those 1 million people have been living through hell for years with a 15-second warning to seek shelter when a rocket attacks. And as a result of that, 13 Israelis have died, but it's inflicted huge harm on the people who live within rocket range in south Israel. One-third of all the children in south Israel suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome. Again, imagine what we would do to stop such attacks if they were directed against us.

That's the fundamental reason why Israel feels obliged, the Israeli military feels obliged, to do what it needs to do to protect its citizens. These ships were not in any way interfered with because they were carrying humanitarian aid. The ships were interfered with for one reason and one reason only. That's because they could have been carrying missiles and rockets and things that could be made into missiles and rockets. It's a fundamental duty of the Israeli military to protect the people of Israel, just as it's a fundamental duty of our military to protect us. What they did was what they needed to do in order to ensure the safety of their own people, and honestly, in the same circumstances, we would have done the same thing.

Thank you very much.

Mr. WEINER. I would say to the gentleman, I would actually argue that the military of Israel used such restraint. I mean, frankly, there aren't too many ways to stop a boat. One of the ways is to fire upon it. They chose to put their own sailors in jeopardy; al-

though there should have been no reason to believe that they would be on a humanitarian boat. Why would anyone expect that someone aboard a humanitarian aid ship would be set upon?

You know, to some degree the media has to be on notice that there is some responsibility to report the context of this thing as well, not just the end. When you see a sailor being tossed overboard, you know, it didn't seem like a very humanitarian act, and there was a shameful display by Reuters, who recently published a photograph of the sailor, the Israeli soldier, that fell on the ground, and they cropped out the guy standing next to him with a knife to explain where all that blood came from. That knife was held by someone on this humanitarian aid ship.

No one knows these facts better than Jerrold Nadler from New York. I would be glad to yield to him at this time.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Thank you, and I thank you for organizing this Special Order.

It has been absolutely galling to watch the hypocrisy and the fury, the underserved fury directed at Israel for taking a step in its own self-defense. The so-called "Freedom flotilla," which went to break the blockade of Gaza, had to be intercepted. Israel and Egypt have been blockading Gaza. They've been blockading it not as humanitarian materials. Thousands and thousands of tons of humanitarian materials and food and supplies go through the checkpoints into Gaza every month by truck. But ships can carry anything.

Israel has stopped ships on the high seas carrying rockets to Gaza. When they were challenged and the Israeli government urged the Turks not to allow this flotilla to sail the way it was—and the Chinese by the way had this right. The Chinese press a day or two before the flotilla was intercepted printed the headline: "Turkey Challenges Israel." Not Israel challenges Turkey. Turkey Challenges Israel by sending these ships knowing that the goal was to break the blockade, not to deliver humanitarian aid.

When the Israelis made clear to the people on board the ships that if you land in Ashdod we will send all the materials straight through to Gaza except for any weapons we find, Greta Berlin, the head of the organization sponsoring it, said, no, we're not interested in delivering humanitarian aid.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, that's right here. It's not like they were being diverted somewhere far off.

Mr. NADLER of New York. They were in armed rocket range.

Mr. WEINER. Exactly.

□ 1915

Mr. NADLER of New York. Twelve miles, to be precise. Greta Berlin said, no, the aim is to break the blockade.

Now, a lot of people, a lot of countries were saying, the President of

France, "How dare they intercept ships on the high seas." "This is piracy," said Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey.

Well, the law is very clear. If you are fighting someone—and Israel is fighting Hamas; Hamas controls the territory and has declared war on Israel and said that war will not stop until Israel is destroyed, maybe a ceasefire from time to time, but this war must continue until Israel is destroyed, as far as Hamas is concerned—then you are subject to blockade. That is a tactic of war.

And in a blockade, you can board the ship, you can, in fact, sink the ship if that's the only way to enforce the blockade, in international waters as long as it's clear that it's going to a blockaded area. And that's from the U.S. Naval Commander's Handbook.

But why was this being done? Because, we are told, they have to break the blockade. Why do they have to break the blockade? Because the overall issue is that we must end the Israeli occupation. This is the real sin. This is why so many people think that Israel is wrong: Because it must end the occupation.

People forget how the occupation started. The occupation of Gaza and the West Bank started when Israel resisted a war of aggression aimed at its extermination in 1967. But we are ignorant of history. History started 5 years ago.

Israel wants to end the occupation. Israel has offered to end the occupation, but there is a problem: Who do you give the land to?

And Israel has experience here. Israel withdrew from Lebanon in 2006, and the U.N. said, "We will send peacekeeping troops, and they will enforce Resolution 1701 to prevent the importation of rockets and arms." And what happened? There are 40,000 missiles in the possession of Hezbollah in Lebanon today because the U.N. peacekeepers stand aside. And Israel has learned that she cannot depend on the U.N. or the international community or anybody else to defend her.

Gaza Israel withdrew from in 2005 and left behind agricultural establishments and other things. What happened? Hamas took over and turned it into a rocket launching pad against Israel. Over 10,000 rockets have been launched against Israel.

Mr. WEINER. Just so everyone understands the points that Mr. NADLER is making, this piece of real estate, about the size of New Jersey, now has a terrorist agent here in Gaza in the south; a terrorist agent up here in Lebanon, governed by Hezbollah, at least about 25 percent of its government is, and Nasrallah, and Hezbollah controls this area here; and a terrorist agent of Iran right here in Syria, which once upon a time controlled literally the mountaintop overlooking the country.

So what the gentleman is describing is terrorist, terrorist, terrorist functions, all in support of the same en-

emies of the United States, and that's Iran.

Mr. NADLER of New York. But Israel still wants to end the occupation. Israel wants to be left in peace. Israel offered in 2000 at Camp David, in 2001 at Taba.

And what was their offer? Israel said, "We will withdraw from the entire Gaza Strip. We will withdraw from 97 percent of the West Bank. We will give land swaps to the Palestinians to make it equivalent to 100 percent of the acreage. And we will share Jerusalem. But, in return, they have to agree that the war is over." They wouldn't agree, and they started the first intifada.

Prime Minister Olmert renewed the offer in 2008, but they will not agree to end of claims or to demilitarization. That's the real issue. If they would agree to that, if the Palestinians would agree that the West Bank cannot be used—if they gave it back, that the West Bank would not be used as a rocket launching pad, that Gaza would not be used as a rocket launching pad, that Israel could live in peace if she withdrew, that deal could be made. And it could be made; it's been offered.

And until the Palestinians are willing to live in peace and are willing to talk about it—the Palestinians, even Abbas, won't even talk to the Israelis now, only to the Americans. Until they are willing to talk and make that agreement, the occupation will continue, and it will be the fault of the Palestinians, not the Israelis.

Mr. WEINER. Well, the gentleman makes an excellent point. And the gentleman from Virginia, I know, is expert on these issues, as well. And it is important to understand that, just today, Mahmoud Abbas was in town.

And I would gladly yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE), who has shown remarkable leadership on these issues in his brief time in the House, to pick up on some of the points that Mr. NADLER made.

Mr. NYE. I would like to start by thanking my colleague from New York for laying out the issue very concisely tonight and for his leadership on the issue. And, as someone who has spent a significant amount of time, myself, both in Israel and in a number of the surrounding countries, I want to rise today to reaffirm the U.S.-Israeli bond of mutual defense and security.

Our friendship gives us peace of mind in knowing that we will always have each other's support in one of the most volatile regions of the world. I maintain my strong support for Israel's right to exist and to protect herself. As the lone bastion of democracy in the region, Israel is our closest ally against terrorist groups, and I am committed to seeing our friendship continue.

The recent loss of life off the coast of Gaza is distressing. However, it is troubling that many have rushed to judgment while failing to recognize the serious security challenges Israel faces every day necessitating the Gaza blockade.

As my colleague has mentioned tonight, Hamas terrorists in Gaza launch frequent rocket attacks directed at Israeli towns than too often take the lives of innocent civilians. And, as our majority leader said earlier this evening in describing a trip that I joined him on last summer, Israeli children are forced to hide in concrete bunkers in order to have a safe place to play.

Hamas makes relentless efforts to import into Gaza, through any means possible, the parts for these deadly rockets, complicating Israel's efforts to safely allow humanitarian aid to enter Gaza.

Lasting peace between the Israelis and Palestinians requires that Israel can assure the safety of its population against terrorist threats. And that is why I recently introduced and helped pass in the House H.R. 5327, the United States-Israel Missile Defense Cooperation and Support Act.

The funds authorized by the bill will allow Israel to build two Iron Dome missile defense batteries that will help protect Israeli citizens living in cities like Sderot, who have been terrorized by over 8,000 indiscriminate rocket and mortar attacks on their homes, schools, and communities.

Mr. Speaker, U.S.-Israeli cooperation on the Iron Dome system will help advance the cause of peace by supporting Israel's ability to defend civilian areas from terrorist attacks, creating the necessary space for a successful peace process.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from New York for his leadership on the issue.

Mr. WEINER. Well, I thank you.

And you are exactly right. Our cooperation with the State of Israel has never been higher, in terms of military and intelligence.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, a member of the Appropriations Committee, a powerful committee, who recently led a delegation to the Middle East which I was honored to be a part of. The House knows no stronger advocate for the U.S.-Israel relationship than she.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And it was an absolute pleasure to join you on the CODEL to the Middle East in January where we learned quite a bit about the progress of the peace process.

And it has been noted by a number of our colleagues this evening that we cannot allow, in spite of all the recent controversy—which is unclear to me why a country that is defending its borders, its territory, and its people is controversial—but that we cannot allow it to take our focus off to that of a nuclear-armed Iran.

One of the things that is unbelievable to me has been the criticism and the questions that have been thrown at Israel: first, that they supposedly boarded the flotilla ships in international waters as if they somehow

didn't have the right to do that. That this is a legal blockade, there isn't any disputing that. They are well within their rights and, understandably, are defending their borders and their people.

Because what country would not make sure that items coming in from a ship to an area that is run by a hostile terrorist organization would not be checked to make sure that they are the genuine humanitarian aid that the people bringing the goods in say that it is? That is simply common sense. And I would think that the citizens of any nation would expect nothing less than their government.

But the other criticism that I have heard during the week is that somehow the people of Gaza—and no one denies that there is suffering that has gone on in Gaza. The people of Gaza went through a war. They continue to be ruled by a terrorist organization, and so, as a result, they are definitely suffering.

But it is important to note that, over the last 18 months, Israel has allowed a steady flow of humanitarian aid and food to go to the people of Gaza. One million tons of humanitarian aid, to be specific, have been allowed into Gaza over the last 18 months, the equivalent of one ton of aid per man, woman, and child in food and materials living in Gaza today.

Mr. WEINER. And I would point out, that same exact offer was made to this flotilla: Come to Ashdod right here. And it wasn't made an hour before; it was made 10 days before, as soon as the word got out, even before it had left port. The nation of Turkey, who was sponsoring this, and the sponsors of the boat were told, "Listen, just go right here, and we will take a look at what you have, and then we will escort it militarily into Gaza for you."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And just a few days later, an Irish ship, the *Rachel Corrie*, was offered the same thing, to take their goods. And they were also challenging the blockade, yet had a very different response and accepted the boarding and accepted travel to the port of Ashdod and had their goods offloaded.

The point is that Israel cannot be expected to stand idly by and allow for goods to be flowing unchecked without making sure that there aren't hostile intentions behind those goods.

And as Israel continues to face unjust criticism on the world stage, the United States must continue and will continue to support our friend, ally, and partner. And I am so proud to stand with my colleagues today.

You have a tragic situation that occurred, but we cannot forget that this blockade exists because Hamas, the ruling party of Gaza, is a terrorist organization with the sworn goal to destroy the Jewish state. A blockade supported by both Israel and Egypt is a means to stop the smuggling of illegal materials and weapons to Hamas.

And I am so pleased that you have organized this special order hour this

evening and look forward to continuing to stand with you.

Mr. WEINER. I thank the gentlewoman. And as someone who represents south Florida, you know that if a boat came churning towards the coast, and let's say it came from Yemen, and it had people on it who were chanting "Death to Floridians," and it wouldn't stop when the military offered it an opportunity to, we would certainly not, as Americans, expect to say, "Okay, we will just see what happens when it reaches shore." You are exactly right to point out the necessity of stopping it in international waters. That's where blockades happen.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), who also understands these issues and, long before she even came to this body, was fighting to preserve the Israel-United States relationship.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I appreciate your organizing this hour of special order and giving us the opportunity to speak about the Gaza flotilla incident and to speak in support of one of our Nation's closest allies, Israel.

While the full details of the incident aboard the lead ship that came in under the flotilla is still under investigation, it is apparent that the organizers of the flotilla intentionally sought to confront Israeli security forces and to defy the embargo of Gaza that was established by Israel and Egypt.

The organizers, the activists, as they called themselves, rejected means offered by Israel—that has been talked about tonight—to deliver the humanitarian aid used by internationally accepted organizations, including the Red Cross, repeatedly, to get that aid to Gaza.

The resulting altercation and loss of life could have been avoided had the organizers of the flotilla agreed to Israel's repeated offers for them to dock at one of their ports and allow the overland transfer of humanitarian aid to Gaza.

□ 1930

Israel has the right to defend and protect herself. The blockade of Gaza exists particularly because it needs to prevent arms being smuggled into Gaza and to protect the citizens of Israel, who have been the subject of thousands of rocket attacks launched by Hamas since 2005. Hamas, which is recognized internationally as an enemy of Israel and as a terrorist organization, has as its mission the destruction and dissolution of the State of Israel and is continuing to be a threat to the safety and security of the residents of Israel.

The loss of life is tragic, but there is no question that the organizers of the flotilla were clearly intent on provoking a military response rather than delivering humanitarian aid; otherwise, they would have worked with Israel to transfer the supplies to Gaza.

I see there are others who want to speak. Let me just conclude by saying

I am proud to stand with my colleague in support of Israel and the right that she has to defend and protect herself. We will continue to work towards peace and security for Israel, and I appreciate being here tonight.

Yet, in spite of the fact that Hamas is singularly focused on the destruction of Israel, Israel currently allows delivery of 10,000–15,000 tons of humanitarian aid a week to the people of Gaza.

The United States will continue to stand by our ally and friend Israel. And we will continue to work closely with all of our allies including Israel to suppress violent extremism around the world. We will continue to work to end hostilities in the Middle East and find a way to ensure security for the State of Israel and a future of peace for the Israeli and Palestinian people.

But, we will do so with a keen understanding of the threats against Israel and the threats against the values we share. I appreciate joining with my colleagues in standing tonight to support our valued friend, Israel and its right to defend herself and protect her people.

Mr. WEINER. I thank the gentlewoman. And I really want to apologize for interrupting you.

Perhaps the most important fighter for Israel in this institution is the chairwoman of the subcommittee, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). I'm glad to recognize you.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order and providing critical details of exactly what happened.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind: Israel has the right to defend herself and the responsibility to protect her citizens from Hamas, which denies Israel's right to exist and rains rockets down on its citizens.

While Israel reviews the flotilla incident and considers the best way to implement the Gaza blockade, we must not forget that failure to prevent weapons and other illicit materials from reaching Hamas would be a dereliction of Israel's most basic responsibility to its people. I stand firmly in support of Israel's right to self-defense, and I am committed to maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge so she can continue to defend her citizens.

As the blame-Israel-first crowd continues to attack our democratic ally, Israel, over a host of challenges in the Middle East, I am reminded of a simple yet powerful concept: "Words matter." The inflammatory rhetoric surrounding events in the Middle East in recent weeks and months only begets more hostility and discourages efforts towards a lasting peace agreement which the people of Israel, the people of the West Bank, and the people of Gaza deserve; and these words can incite those encouraging violence against Israel.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our allies in Israel are in the midst of an ongoing crisis. Last week, this became crystal clear when so-called "freedom activists" attacked IDF soldiers. Regrettably, nine activists were killed and several Israelis were injured.

In the aftermath of this incident, Israel has endured criticisms from Turkey, the United Nations, and the press. Even the U.S. Administration has been somewhat muted in its support of Israel's self-defense. These responses mystify me when I consider the background and reality of recent events.

Fact: Israel is at war with Hamas. Hamas, which is recognized as a terrorist organization by the United States and the European Union, still abides by a charter which calls for the destruction of the State of Israel. Furthermore, Hamas continues to espouse anti-Semitic propaganda en masse. Since 2001, thousands of rockets have been launched from Gaza into civilian-populated areas in southern Israel, indiscriminately killing and injuring innocent, unsuspecting men, women, and children. That's why I introduced legislation in 2008 which highlighted and condemned the ongoing rocket attacks. My resolution passed the House with strong bi-partisan support, but the rocket attacks have continued.

Fact: Israel is not at war with the peaceful citizens of Gaza. Israel fully withdrew its soldiers and citizens from the Gaza Strip in 2005 in the hopes of attaining peace and creating an environment conducive to negotiations with the Palestinian Authority. Last week, after Israel diverted the flotilla to the port of Ashdod for inspection, Israel proceeded to transport the humanitarian cargo to the Gaza Strip. In fact, Israel takes a proactive stance in providing humanitarian supplies to Gaza's civilians.

Fact: Israel did not violate international law by imposing a blockade on Gaza. Historically, any sovereign nation at war may impose a blockade. Egypt, for example, had imposed a blockade on Gaza. The U.S. itself imposed a blockade on the Confederates during the Civil War, on Cuba during the Cold War, and on Germany and Japan during World War II. Israel is justified in its attempts to prevent radical organizations from supplying Hamas with weapons that could eventually harm Israeli civilians. To further that end, I recently introduced H. Res. 1241, which supports Israel's right to maintain and construct security fences along its borders.

Fact: The interception of the Mavi Marmara was not an isolated action by the Israeli Defense Forces. In recent history, Israel has peacefully diverted nine other "humanitarian" missions, inspected their cargoes, and delivered the aid to Gaza. The boarding tactics employed last week were necessary to restrain such a large vessel.

Fact: The main mission of the flotilla was not to provide humanitarian supplies for civilians in Gaza. The six ships were sponsored in part by the IHH, an extremist Turkish organization with ties to terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda. While the IDF peacefully boarded five of the six vessels that made up the flotilla, activists and militants aboard the sixth vessel had armed themselves with iron bars, knives, and clubs.

Fact: Hamas is not Israel's only threat. In 2002, Israel intercepted a ship in the Red Sea which was carrying 50 tons of weaponry provided by Iran. In November of last year, Israel intercepted an Iranian ship carrying hundreds of tons of weaponry to Hezbollah in Lebanon. Iran's president has repeatedly declared his hatred for Israel while continuing his pursuit of nuclear weapon development. As a member of the Iran Sanctions Conference Committee, I

will continue to support prompt, strong action to deter Iran's evil ambitions.

I must ask those who condemn Israel, "Have you examined the facts?" It is crucial for the United States to stand beside Israel during these tumultuous times and I am heartened that more than a dozen senators and over 60 of my House colleagues have released statements supporting Israel. I urge the Administration, the media, and American citizens to join us in defending Israel from false assertions. Moreover, I encourage the Attorney General to prosecute any American citizen who aids Hamas. The strategic relationship between our two democratic governments must withstand the threats and actions of terrorists who seek to create a rift between our two nations.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the long-standing conflict in the Middle East unfortunately has added a new and tragic event to its history. I deeply regret the loss of life that occurred on May 31, 2010 when the Israel Defense Force intercepted the flotilla of six ships that sailed from Turkey to Gaza. Events went horribly awry when nine people died.

I want to repeat my support for the State of Israel and its right to defend itself from terrorist attacks in the strongest terms possible. Since 2005, when Israel disengaged from Gaza, over 10,000 rockets have been fired on the Jewish State, endangering the lives of thousands of civilians. Israel's naval blockade of Gaza has helped to ensure that the supply of munitions and weapons to Hamas, which has controlled the Gaza Strip since 2007, is kept to the lowest extent possible. The flotilla incident demonstrates once again that increased pressure must be placed on Hamas to recognize Israel's right to exist and to renounce terror. In addition, progress must be made in resolving the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians so that they can live in peace and security.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt in anyone's mind: Israel has the right to defend herself and the responsibility to protect her citizens from Hamas, which denies Israel's right to exist and rains rockets down on its citizens.

While Israel reviews the Gaza flotilla incident and considers the best way to implement the Gaza blockade, we must not forget that failure to prevent weapons and other illicit materials from reaching Hamas would be a dereliction of Israel's most basic responsibility to its people. I stand firmly in support of Israel's right to self-defense and am committed to maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge so she can continue to defend her citizens.

As the 'Blame Israel First' crowd continues to attack our democratic ally Israel over a host of challenges in the Middle East, I am reminded of a simple—yet powerful—concept: words matter. The inflammatory rhetoric surrounding events in the Middle East in recent weeks and months only begets more hostility; discourages efforts toward a lasting peace agreement, which the people of Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza deserve; and can incite those encouraging violence against Israel.

The Administration focused today on humanitarian and development assistance to strengthen the Palestinian Authority so it can serve as a viable partner in peace to Israel. Abu Mazen must make clear to all the Palestinian people that their security and a prosperous future depends on rejecting Hamas,

recognizing Israel and working with the international community and Israel to achieve a two state solution.

Despite the current, tense environment, some positive steps have been taken that will improve Israel's security as well as bolster U.S. national security interests.

Iran continues to be an existential threat to Israel, the region and the world, and I am pleased today's agreement by the U.N. Security Council to impose multilateral sanctions on Iran will hold the regime accountable for its reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons. I look forward to Congress finalizing strong bilateral sanctions and urge European partners and other responsible countries to do the same.

We must continue to strongly support the U.S.-Israel partnership which provides invaluable benefits to both of our countries national security.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East, is our strong ally and true friend. Innocent Israelis endure attacks far too often.

Unfortunately, following the May 31 flotilla incident, Israel has come under assault in the media and international community once again.

This has resulted in a particularly sad time for the historically strong partnership between Israel and Turkey. As a bridge between East and West, Turkey is a source of dialogue between cultures, particularly for the Jewish people, who have lived in Turkey for more than five hundred years. This history has characterized the special relationship between these two countries since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948. For this reason, Prime Minister Erdogan's brazen rhetoric, support for the terrorist group, Hamas, and today's decision to vote against sanctions in the Security Council are misguided and thoroughly disappointing.

It is unfortunate that a leader, who once opened his country's doors to all of its neighbors, now chooses to follow the radical, fundamentalist maneuvers of groups like the IHH, instead of practicing the diplomacy for which it has been known.

Despite what Hamas supporters may be claiming now, the May 31, 2010 flotilla incident wasn't about bringing in supplies. It was about provoking Israel, a country whose people have been subject to countless terrorist attacks from Hamas supporters in the Gaza Strip. No one should be led astray, Hamas is a terrorist organization that stands for the annihilation of Israel and should not and cannot be accepted as a legitimate voice in Gaza. And, Just as America protects its borders, Israel—and any other country—has the right to maintain and defend its own borders.

Since Israel instituted its Gaza blockade, terrorist attacks against Israeli civilians have dramatically decreased, and it is not hard to see how the Israeli government would perceive the flotilla's actions as a direct confrontation. Primarily, though, we need to remain focused on what really threatens the shared interests of all democratic countries—a nuclear armed Iran. This is why I believe it is in our country's best interest to lower tensions in the Eastern Mediterranean. Turkey has unfortunately disappointed the global community today with its vote in the UN Security Council, but the passage of the sanctions package is an overwhelming victory for the United States, Israel and the overall security of the international community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3473. An act to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to authorize advances from Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 111-148, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Commission on Key National Indicators:

Dr. Wade F. Horn of Maryland (for a term of 3 years); and

Dr. Nichols N. Eberstadt of the District of Columbia (for a term of 2 years).

NOTIFICATION OF TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS WITH RESPECT TO ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN PERMANENT MUNITIONS EXPORT LICENSES FOR EXPORTS TO CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-120)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246) (the “Act”), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspensions under section 902(a)(3) of the Act with respect to the issuance of permanent munitions export licenses for exports to the People’s Republic of China insofar as such restrictions pertain to the LightScanner® 32 System used for gene mutation genotyping for individualized cancer treatment. License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review on a case-by-case basis by the United States Government.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 2010.

THE ISRAEL BLOCKADE AND THE FLOTILLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY.)

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman. I’m just going to complete my statement, and I appreciate your generosity.

The administration focused today on humanitarian and development assistance to strengthen the Palestinian Authority so it can serve as a viable partner in peace to Israel. But Abu Mazen must make clear to all the Palestinian people that their security and prosperous future—and we’ve seen an 11 percent growth in the West Bank—depends on rejecting Hamas, recognizing Israel, and working with the international community and Israel to achieve a two-state solution.

Despite the current tense environment, some positive steps have been taken that will improve Israel’s security as well as bolster U.S. national security interests. Iran continues to be an existential threat to Israel, the region, and the world. I am pleased today’s agreement by the U.N. Security Council to impose multilateral sanctions on Iran will hold the regime accountable for its reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons, and I look forward to Congress finalizing strong bilateral sanctions and urge European partners and other responsible countries to do the same.

We must continue to strongly support the U.S.-Israeli partnership which provides invaluable benefits to both of our countries’ national securities.

Mr. AKIN. I yield to my good friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman, and I will be brief. I rise in support of everything that my colleagues have said.

The U.S.-Israel relationship is a special relationship, and it’s a relationship that needs to be strengthened. The United States is Israel’s only true friend. In fact, when you look at the United Nations or the so-called Human Rights Council in the United Nations, it’s really a kangaroo court stacked up against Israel. No wonder Israel doesn’t accept what the so-called “international body” says about them, because they can never do anything right. They’re always condemned no matter what they try, no matter what they do.

My colleagues have pointed out that Israel, like every other sovereign nation, has the right to defend itself, that Israel has at least twice seized large caches of arms aboard Iranian ships bound for Hamas and Hezbollah, and a blockade is an appropriate security measure when employed in the face of hostility such as that directed by Hamas against Israel.

Hamas doesn’t recognize Israel’s right to exist, has vowed to destroy Israel, won’t abide by any agreements that have been signed by Israel and the previous Palestinian governments, and so Israel has to make sure that terrorist attacks don’t come from Gaza into Israel as they have for such a long time. As my colleagues have pointed out, Israel has offered to inspect the flotillas and let all the humanitarian

aid on the flotillas go to Gaza, but these people on the flotilla were obviously not interested in delivering humanitarian aid. They were interested in provoking a violent reaction from Israel.

I just want to stand in support of the U.S.-Israel relationship, a strong relationship. Israel is our best friend and ally in the Middle East. Hopefully, soon there will be a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, two states side by side living in peace and harmony, a Palestinian state and an Israeli Jewish state. That is something that we all strive to work for.

I want to thank Mr. WEINER for organizing this. I want to thank Mr. HOYER, our majority leader, for always being a stalwart. I want to thank Mr. AKIN for giving us the opportunity to speak. When it comes to Israel, this Congress is united with strong bipartisan support, and we’re going to keep it that way.

Thank you.

Mr. AKIN. I thank the gentleman. I think you’re articulate, and I think that that’s accurate to say: there is a good bipartisan sentiment that when a small nation is trying to defend itself, we have always stood for people.

The basic principle of people being allowed to be free and have some self-determination as to how they’re going to rule their own country and be free from the fear of terrorists, that’s something that Americans can really agree on. I appreciate you taking time on that subject, and also my good friend from New York taking the time to organize the hour. Very good job. Thank you.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman would briefly yield, I, too, want to add my thanks to you. I don’t know if they have C-SPAN in Israel, but sometimes it’s easy in that little country to feel beset on all sides. We share the same common sense that they do, that they’re victims of terror, and I want to thank you.

We disagree on a lot in this place—and you’re going to spend the next hour or so pointing out some of those things—but there are some things that have broad bipartisan support, and the support of Israel is one of those things, and I want to thank you for being at the forefront of that.

Mr. AKIN. Well, thank you very much, gentleman. And thank you for the leadership you’ve shown tonight.

DEMOCRAT’S MANAGEMENT OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. AKIN. I would now change gears here and get on to another subject.

We’re dealing with some weighty topics tonight; the previous was of course international relations, the other is closer to home, and it’s really the question of the economy: the Democrats’ management of the economy, what should be done with the economy, how does that affect jobs and how does that affect all of our lives. I guess it sounds like kind of a boring subject in some ways; but on the other hand, it so much influences and affects every single person in our country that I guess

we have to put up with a little bit of talk about economics just to make sure that we're not destroying our country or destroying our jobs and putting our grandchildren into debt. And so the whole topic of economics and jobs can be a little perplexing, but it doesn't have to be.

I do apologize ahead of time that I am, by training, an engineer. Someone once said that engineers shouldn't be allowed in political office perhaps because they're too logical, or whatever the reasons are. But I do think it's important to back up just a little bit to say where we are here in the economy and how we got to where we're going and what mistakes have been made.

I'm not one to want to just criticize and not offer a solution, so I'm going to try to do that. I'm going to try to draw some practical applications as we wrap up in a while as to what we should be doing, what policies should be changed, what does America have to do to pull ourselves out of the economic nosedive that we're currently in.

It's not a graveyard spiral. There were days in the early days of airplanes that when a pilot pulled his airplane up into a stall, fell over backwards, he would get into what was called a graveyard spiral. And the pilot would grab the stick of the airplane, pull it back violently to try to get the nose of the airplane to pull off from the ground and the airplane would just keep spiraling down and crash into the ground. It ruined the pilot's whole day. Our economy may be at a graveyard spiral, but there are things that we can do to prevent it from crashing, but we're going to have to do that and do it soon. So that's what I want to take a look at.

I want to back up just a little bit to the days back at this superconservative oracle, *The New York Times*. This is September 11, 2003. This is really the beginning of President Bush's Presidency, and he goes to the *New York Times*—and this is September 11, but it's not 2001, it's 2003—and it says here, this is the article: The Bush administration today recommended the most significant regulatory overhaul in the housing finance industry since the savings and loan crisis a decade ago. That's interesting. President Bush was saying in 2003 that we've got to take a look at this finance industry and the overhaul of this housing finance industry. And under the plan disclosed at a congressional hearing today, a new agency would be created within the Treasury Department to assume supervision of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the government-sponsored companies that are the two largest players in the mortgage lending industry. Interesting. This is way before the mortgage-backed security thing hit the fan and the whole stock market crashed and all that sort of stuff; this is way before that.

So President Bush, he's saying, okay, let's regulate these because they're out of control. They've lost \$1 billion or

something. And he thought, well, that's not pocket change. Here's the President asking for this authority, and what do we have from then in the minority? We had this from Representative FRANK, he says: These two entities, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, are not facing any kind of financial crisis. The more people exaggerate these problems, the more pressure there is on these companies, the less we will see in terms of affordable housing. Now, people who know Freddie and Fannie know that these guys were big players here on the Hill. They had lobbyists that were terribly effective, went around and distributed a whole lot of money to a lot of people, and they didn't want anybody playing in the deal they had going.

So what happened here? Well, what happened was the House—at that time in Republican control—passed a bill to regulate Freddie and Fannie. It went to the Senate, and what do you think happened to it? Well, in those days, Republicans had a majority in the Senate, but they didn't have the 60 votes necessary for cloture, and so the bill was killed by Democrats in the Senate. Freddie and Fannie continued on their merry way, and all of a sudden, a number of years later, what other people had seen—Bush had seen years before—was going to happen, it happened, and we had this great big crisis start. Now, that was all connected with ACORN, the organization that was pushing banks to make loans that normally a bank wouldn't make because the people that the loans were going to be made to couldn't afford to pay them.

So we started going on this track of passing out loans to people that couldn't afford to pay them, and every time we sold one of those loans, somebody made some money. And what did they do with all of those bad loans? They dumped them all on Freddie and Fannie. And as you know, you just keep doing something like this, pretty soon the music is going to stop and there are going to be people without chairs. That's what happened in the savings and loan problem.

□ 1945

Now, what is going to be the solution? Well, we are going to talk a little bit about that, about where we are going with the economy and about what we need to be doing.

I am joined now in the Chamber by a good friend of mine, Dr. PAUL BROWN, from the Atlanta, Georgia area, if I recall properly—not Atlanta but, rather, some other part of Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The northeast corner of the State of Georgia. Athens and Augusta are my two major cities.

Mr. AKIN. I yield to the gentleman. I don't know what you think about Atlanta, so I won't say anything about that.

My good friend from Georgia, Congressman and Dr. BROWN, please join us.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well, thank you, Mr. AKIN, for yielding.

I'll tell you what. I hope the American people paid attention to your explanation because it has been Democrats all along who have fought any reform of Freddie and Fannie. Freddie and Fannie are right in the middle of the cause of the financial downturn that we've seen today.

Just today, we voted on trying to name a committee of conferees from the House and the Senate to talk about financial services, and we tried to bring Freddie and Fannie into the fold, but Democrats across the board have rejected from 2003, all the way up to today, to solve the problem. When you have a fire going, you want to try and find out the source of that fire and put out the source.

I'm a medical doctor. When you have a medical problem going on, you try to find the source of that problem. If you have a cancer, you want to not just deal with the symptoms of the cancer or even of the metastasis—the spread—of the cancer, but you want to go with the primary tumor and get it out.

So Freddie and Fannie are the source of the problem, and Democrats across the board have resisted from 2003, all the way to today, the efforts the Republicans have made to try to cut out this cancer of Freddie and Fannie.

Mr. AKIN. I think what you're saying is important. You're using some doctors' analogies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I'm a doctor.

Mr. AKIN. I think that's good. It paints a vivid picture, but there is a problem with Freddie and Fannie.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. AKIN. The problem with Freddie and Fannie is you don't get something for nothing. I'm an engineer. I mean, it's one of those things, if it isn't there, it isn't there. So what we're doing is we're using Freddie and Fannie to make loans to a certain number of people who can't afford to pay them. Then that means, Where is the money going to come from?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Taxpayers.

Mr. AKIN. That's the point.

So the deal is: Is it the job of the American public to bail out people who make irresponsible loans? How about all of the people who get loans, who make their mortgage payments, who do everything by the book, who then get hammered because somebody else didn't do it that way? That's the basic question.

Is there any sense of fairness in this? Is this a good way to run a ship? Because what we're doing is creating an incentive for people to do the wrong thing, which is to take loans they can't afford to pay. They put more stress on their own families economically.

How is that compassionate, by the way, when you're the dad, supposedly providing for your family, and you're in danger every month of the mortgage payment, and they're going to put you and the kids and the sofa out on the front sidewalk? That's not compassionate. Yet that's what these policies

on Freddie and Fannie are doing. So we need to reform Freddie and Fannie, and apparently, we're not willing to do that.

Hey, I want to jump forward just a little bit, gentleman. I want to jump forward now past Freddie and Fannie. We've got the whole trouble with Wall Street starting to melt down. We do the great big bailout of Wall Street. Then the center point of the Democrats' plan was the stimulus package. Unemployment started to go up, and the economy was dipping. They said, This is a great opportunity for us to spend money on all the things we want to spend money on. So they spent \$800 billion on the stimulus package, which is a whole lot of money, and the idea was, if we spend enough money, it will get the economy going again in spite of fixing Freddie and Fannie.

Now, what do you think about that theory that, if the government spends tons of money, it's going to somehow get the economy going? You know, a lot of people believe that idea.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, I thank you, Mr. AKIN, for yielding.

This has been described as Keynesian economics, which means bigger government spending and more borrowing. You've got a great quote there by Henry Morgenthau, who was FDR's Treasury Secretary. During part of the Great Depression, he made this great quote, which reads, in part, that we have just as much unemployment as when we started all of this massive government spending, and an enormous debt to boot. That's exactly what we're doing.

Most American people know—not all, and it's unfortunate. Most American people know that socialism never has worked and never will work, but this is socialistic, this type of philosophy of bigger government, of central control from wherever the capital is. We saw it in the Soviet Union. It is what Stalin put up there in the Soviet Union. In fact, FDR sent his lieutenants to Russia. Back during that period of time when the Great Depression started, which was early on in the Roosevelt Presidency, he sent his lieutenants to look at what Stalin was doing because they thought this was the greatest thing in the world and that we needed to put in place that kind of policy here. That's exactly what is going on right now with our leadership. They may as well send their lieutenants back. They should go back and look at the history of what Stalin did, and they should understand from history that it doesn't work, because it will not and cannot.

Mr. AKIN. You know, I really appreciate your jumping a little bit ahead because you anticipated where I'm going.

There have been some assumptions made by the Democrats about the economy, and the question is: Are those assumptions any good or not?

One of the things that history does tell us is we should learn something

from it. Of course, FDR's Treasury Secretary, Henry Morgenthau, after trying it for 8 years, turned a recession into the Great Depression, and we consider it the greatest depression we had. What they did was they just spent tons of Federal money, but at least they spent it on concrete, like great big dams and roads and building projects. Of course, the \$800 billion that we spent wasn't spent on a lot of stuff. It was much more of just government giveaways.

We are joined by my good friend, Congresswoman LUMMIS. I would just be delighted if you could jump into our conversation here. We are focusing, really, on the economy: What assumptions have been done that are wrong? What do we need to get it fixed so as to straighten things out?

Mrs. LUMMIS. Well, thank you. I thank the gentlemen for allowing me to join you both this evening.

I thank the gentleman for his courtesy to the previous group that was talking about our policy with Israel. I thought that was appropriate to allow them to finish their remarks and to acknowledge the importance of our allies there.

One of the issues that we are going to have to address, as we address this economic downturn we are in, is the role of the Federal Government in exacerbating the problem.

As we all know, Federal employment and private-sector employment are not the same thing. A private-sector job pays for other people's jobs through taxes; whereas, a public-sector job consumes more than it pays in taxes. So it's important that we watch the relationship and the growth of Federal jobs versus the decline in private jobs.

This first chart that I have shows the Federal Government employment and how it has changed in the past number of years. I'd like to point out the years 2002, 3, 4, 5, and 6 when the Federal Government's employment was relatively flat—in fact, almost as flat as a pancake. Then we get into the Pelosi Congress, and it's going up markedly, with the year 2010 here on the end of this chart showing you that we're getting back to levels that are unprecedented since Republicans took over control of Congress in 1995.

I also want to illustrate what has happened to private-sector employment during this time period. This chart compares private-sector employment to public-sector employment, or government employment. The red line is government employment. This more flat line of the red line illustrates, once again, those years that were relatively stable—2003, 4, 5, and 6. Then the Pelosi Congress took effect, and here the government employment begins to shoot up.

The scary part of this chart is the blue line, which is what is happening to private-sector employment. It has crested. Then from the Pelosi Congress on, it has declined dramatically, and these are the years of the Pelosi Congress. When private-sector employment

plummets, the ability to pay for your family plummets. Unemployment payments go up. Of course, those are coming out of the public sector. Tax collections go down. The number of jobs, of course, declines dramatically. This is an illustration of what has happened to our economy. Unless we get this number under control, we are in trouble.

Among the things that I oppose, which the majority party here in Congress is pursuing, are tax increases on the employer class. The employer class includes those small businesses all over the country which are employing less than 50 employees who are unable to borrow money because of the constraints on capital that you addressed earlier, Mr. AKIN. All of these create the downward spiral that we are seeing. In order to get out of that spiral, we have to make dramatic changes in our tax policy, in our spending policy, and in our overall economic policy in relation to other countries and in relation to the amount of debt that we are issuing.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mr. AKIN. I yield you time, gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, I'm sorry. I apologize, Mr. AKIN.

I just wanted to address those things that you were talking about, Mr. AKIN—the Great Depression, the government spending and that the unemployment didn't go up. As to what Mrs. LUMMIS just so very capably showed us, government jobs are going up.

During the Depression, though, as you just said, there was a lot of spending on infrastructure during that period of time. It did not take care of the unemployment. If you look at the unemployment rate during the Great Depression, it stayed relatively flat. It went up and down some, but it stayed up a bit, and then it fell way off in spite of all the big government spending and all the spending on infrastructure.

Back then, though, under the Roosevelt administration, they created the WPA and the CCC camps and things like that. They put people to work, who were on government welfare, building all that infrastructure. Now we're paying people not to work.

Mr. AKIN. So things have changed, and it has gotten even worse, hasn't it?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It really has.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just jump in for a moment.

You know, the charts that you chose actually have a relationship to each other, and you alluded to the mechanics of what that connection is, which is, when the government creates a job by hiring somebody, it does create a job. The problem is it kills two other jobs in the private sector. So you think to yourself, hey, if we have unemployment, for the temporary sense, let's get the government to spend some money and hire a bunch of people, and that will take care of the problem in the

short term. Maybe the economy will rebound, and then maybe the government will shrink, and more private-sector jobs will come along. Not so. What happens, in fact, is, when the government creates jobs, it spends a whole lot more money. It takes money away from the private sector, and it drives the number of private jobs down.

So what you've just shown is an illustration and an example of a failed economic policy. It's a failed economic policy, and we should have known from Henry Morgenthau that it wasn't any good and that it wasn't going to work. He said, Look. We've tried spending money. We're spending more than we've ever spent before, and it doesn't work. Now we're turning around and are doing it over again. With 8 years in the administration, we've just as much unemployment as when we started and an enormous debt to boot.

So what are we doing now? Oh, we're repeating this same foolish policy.

Here it is. Nobody really wants to look at this graph. This is the deficit under the Democrat budget. Now, I'm a Republican, and I'll admit that we spent too much money when President Bush was President, but it wasn't as bad as it could have been. People didn't know how bad it could be. Now we do. Take a look at that. The very worst year of President Bush's spending was in the Pelosi Congress here in 2008. That was his highest amount of deficit in a given year. That's one-third of what it was under Obama, the next year, and this is even more so.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I wanted to put some perspective on 2008, too. That's when the President's chief economic adviser—I guess the Treasury Secretary—told him that the sky was falling and that we needed to pass the Toxic Asset Relief Program, or TARP, which many Republicans voted against. I didn't buy the Democratic Treasury Secretary under a Republican President because that's exactly what Hank Paulson is. He's a Wall Street insider, a Wall Street banker. Wall Street believes in big government. That's the reason they support the Democrats. They overwhelmingly support Democrats financially.

That increase in 2008, under Bush, is principally because of the TARP bill that a lot of people didn't like. I did not vote for that. I've argued very much against it, and I have been a strong critic of the Bush administration's being big spenders, but they were pikers compared to the Pelosi Congress ever since she has been in charge.

□ 2000

And even that is just miniscule compared to what has happened just over the last 16, 17 months.

Mr. AKIN. It seems to me, gentlemen, that President Bush was Ebenezer Scrooge by comparison to what we've got here. I mean, this is runaway spending.

And this is created not just by TARP, not just by the, quote, "jobs bill" where we just dumped all kinds of money into increasing various government handouts and things. It wasn't concrete and roads; it was just government-handout kinds of things.

But this tremendous level of spending then creates the very problem which creates the unemployment, and it threatens our economy.

If you take a look at where this is going, you take a look at these numbers, and you start to put it—these seem like a lot of money. This one here is \$1.4 trillion. Well, what does \$1.4 trillion mean? Well, let's put it into context.

Here's the context right here. This is a comparison to these other countries over in Europe. This is deficit as a percent of GDP. United States, 10.3. We've got Greece at 9.4.

Now, Greece has been in the news. It's been causing a whole lot of trouble in the European Union. And its deficit as a percent of GDP is 9.4, and we're 10.3? These are not good numbers.

I think it's helpful to compare to the others. United Kingdom is a little worse off than we are. If you go debt, this is a larger term, this is going year after year after year, you see United States here is at 99, debt as a percent of GDP. And you've got Greece and Italy that are worse off than we are.

That's not a good sign when we're in third place to Greece and Italy from an economic point of view. So this rate of spending just does not work. This is a glide path.

I used the analogy of, you know, the guys, the World War I pilots that used to fly those airplanes, whatever it was that Snoopy used to fly. Many of those planes, they would get into that spiral and they would just start to head down for the Earth.

And that is what has happened, is, because of lousy economics, we are in essentially a graveyard spiral in America. And you, my friends, know what the solution is to fix this.

And there was a solution to the graveyard spiral. And maybe it seemed a little counterintuitive, but from a pilot's point of view, what they're supposed to do—their instinct is to pull back on the stick to pull the nose up. Instead, you had to do the counterintuitive thing, which is push the stick down. And that would stop the spiral, the plane would start diving, and when they had control, then they could pull the stick back up again.

And there's the same kind of thing in our economy, which we have to do or this economy is going to crash. And if you think 10 percent is bad for unemployment, it could get a whole lot worse.

I yield to my good friend, Congresswoman LUMMIS.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The chart he has up does compare the U.S. to Greece. But what is really frightening about that chart is, in 5

years, our debt to GDP will be at 112 percent, whereas right now Greece is 115 percent. In other words, in 5 years, we're going to be right where Greece is right now. And that illustrates the type of nosedive that the gentleman said we are in.

Mr. AKIN, could I ask you to put up the chart that you have there that is called "Tidal Wave of Debt"?

The chart that he's going to put up was prominently displayed on numerous occasions today in the House Budget Committee, where we heard from Dr. Ben Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Multiple questions made reference to this chart. And it is the trajectory on this chart that Dr. Bernanke expressed such concern about.

If you look at the line of 2010 and follow it through the year 2046, which is the end line of that chart, you see the enormous upward spiral of our debt. This is, of course, part of the unsustainable situation that Dr. Bernanke was asking us to address. And if we do not, we will put our country in terrible financial straits.

So, we talked about a number of alternatives.

One is americanroadmap.org, which is the ranking member of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN's proposal. It is very comprehensive. It would have a slow glide path to bring both our deficits and our debt under complete control, and do it without raising taxes, and do it without affecting the Social Security or Medicare benefits of people over age 55 or 56.

The problem is, the longer we wait, the more out of reach that type of strategy becomes because of the enormous crowding out of our budgets that will happen by interest on our national debt. Consequently, we need to address the Paul Ryan proposal sooner rather than later.

Even under the Paul Ryan scenario, when compared to our anemic economy, the budget cannot be balanced and the debt cannot be eliminated until the second half of this century. So it takes over 40 years, given that scenario, to balance the budget and eliminate the debt. However, that is the kind of slow glide path that we have to take with an economy this anemic, and in a way that does not raise taxes.

And if we learned anything from the Japanese in the 1990s, it was: You don't raise taxes during a recession. That is what slowed and retarded their growth out of their economic slump.

Mr. AKIN. That's a great point. And let's repeat that. What you just said was, you don't raise taxes during a recession.

And what we are going to talk about here tonight—there are some bad assumptions that were made that are destroying our country and that are destroying our budget, our economy, and just killing jobs in America and creating a whole lot of hardship.

But it doesn't have to be that way. There is potentially good news. But we

just have to follow the principles, just like airplanes follow aerodynamics, we have to follow the principles of economics. And one of those—you just got to the bottom line—is, you've got to ease off on the taxes. And there is a logical reason for it.

Let's just take a look, though, so people understand the gravity of what we are looking at. This is who owns our debt. This debt is created because we are promising all kinds of benefits to American citizens, all kinds of promises that we are going to give them health care and we are going to give them housing and food and education and all the stuff that the Soviet Union also promised their citizens. And who is picking up the tab? A lot of foreigners are buying our debt.

Here it is. Foreign holding of American debt was 5 percent in 1970. That was when I graduated from college. Foreign holdings, 1990, 20 years later, go from 5 to 19 percent in 20 years. Now, 20 years later, in 2010, foreign holdings, 47 percent.

Is that healthy? How much longer are the Chinese and the other foreign countries going to continue to pay us money that we don't have to pay off American voters just to keep them happy? This is a glide path that will end up in a crash.

The gentlewoman, Congresswoman LUMMIS, has suggested that, even now, trying to pull this thing out is going to take a number of years. This isn't something that can be turned around overnight.

And I think this 20-year kind of pattern reflects the fact that what we are talking about is really serious here, but it still is basic economic principles.

Mrs. LUMMIS. In May of this year, we issued some Treasury bonds, and the sale was undersubscribed, which means there were not enough countries or individuals who purchased U.S. treasuries, our debt, at the price at which they are being offered, which means that pretty soon we are going to have to raise the interest rates that we are willing to pay people who purchase our debt.

When we have to raise our interest rates, that means that we are paying more in interest on the debt every year. That crowds out private investment from our economy. That makes it more difficult for the private sector to create the jobs that were on this chart earlier. That is part of the death spiral that we have been talking about.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to yield a little time to my good friend from Georgia, please, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you.

And I like this cartoon that you just put up, because this just shows what is going on here, not only with our debt, with health care reform.

I call it "tax-and-trade" because it is about revenue. The President himself said it was about raising more revenue for the Federal Government. It's not about the environment at all. In fact, a lot of what the President has said, he

has admitted it is not about the environment. It is about revenue and a bigger government, greater control, central planning from Washington, D.C., and then the war tax.

They are adding tax after tax, and we are expecting the Chinese to buy our debt. In other words, we are spending our children and grandchildren's future, and the credit card is being held by the Chinese.

And it is something that is totally unsustainable. And what it is going to do, long term, is our children and grandchildren are going to live at a lower standard than we live today because this is totally unsustainable, totally unsustainable.

Mr. AKIN. I think you're an optimist. I really do. I'm not so sure that our children and grandchildren will live at a lower standard quite the way you're talking about. I'm not sure that this is not going to create a more catastrophic kind of crash, where the whole credit system of the United States—if your Treasury bill is no longer any good, you have, by definition, just crashed your airplane into the ground and it's going to ruin your whole day.

You are talking about a crisis unlike anything we have seen ever in our history. That is what is potentially there. I don't think we should be overly dramatic about it, but this is really serious stuff.

And what this cartoon is trying to point out is that there are a whole series of Obama policies; every single one of them is diving the plane faster and faster toward the ground.

First of all, there was the Wall Street bailout. Then there was the stimulus bill, which was supposed to create jobs. We saw how well that has worked. The private job creation is in the dirt, and we are creating all the jobs by hiring government bureaucrats who are paying more than the poor guys working in the private sector. That doesn't work.

And then you've got this cap-and-trade. "Cap-and-tax" is what I call it. It was passed out of the House. What a mess that is. I am an engineer by training. It is supposed to save us from global warming, but all it is, is more big government and more taxes. Fortunately, the Senate is not dumb enough to have passed it yet.

And then you've got, of course, the socialized medicine deal, which surely will break the budget unless they put in enough waiting lines for everybody and enough rationing so that it won't break the Federal budget.

So all of these policies together are creating those numbers and those graphs that we see.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield before you take the chart away?

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, there's a bull that's in that china shop that's not indicated in this cartoon, and that's the abject failure, non-stimulus bill, as I call it, which has been an ab-

ject failure. The non-stimulus bill has been an abject failure, and it's going to be a job-killer.

Everything that this administration, that this leadership in Congress today is doing is killing jobs. And it's not doing anything except for creating a bigger government and creating temporary government employees. It's creating a lot of jobs here in Washington, D.C., but they don't help my State of Georgia. They don't help New York State or California or Texas.

They are creating a bigger central government that's going to kill our freedom. And we've got to stop it.

Mr. AKIN. The thing is, you and I are not talking can tonight, we're not talking about tonight something that is speculative or based on theory. These graphs are ending in 2010. These are actual numbers. This is what has happened, and it doesn't work. It didn't work for FDR, and it's not going to work for President Obama and the Democrats. It just won't work.

That is what is happening to employment in the private sector. And the red line, of course, is government. And a whole lot of that is these census people running around and snooping on everybody and figuring out who lives in what house and everything, which, of course, makes you feel just wonderful that we're putting those kind of government jobs on instead of just killing manufacturing.

Let's get to the mechanics, though, because all of this stuff, it's not rocket science. This is basic, basic economics.

□ 2015

I just wish some of the Democrats had run lemonade stands when they were kids. They could understand some real simple kinds of economics here.

One of the things, we had a town hall meeting back in my district. I thought maybe I am getting too radical, maybe I have been here too long. You know that old folk song you have been on the job too long. So I asked them. I said, Now, if you wanted to kill jobs, what would you do? What are the job killers? You know what was the top of their list? Excessive taxation.

Now, this is a connection that you were making, gentlelady, a moment ago, between the taxes and these jobs going down. And of course part of what you use the taxes for is to pay for all these public sector jobs. So what's the connection here? Why is it that taxation just kills the economy? It's not just any taxation, but it's particularly taxation on what? On businesses. Why? Because businesses have to have money in order to add new processes, come up with new technology, new machines, a new building to do something in. They have got to have some money to do it with. And if you take it all away by taxing them, you make it so that they can't create the new jobs.

The places where jobs are created in America are largely, 80 percent of the jobs, are in corporations of 500 or fewer people, which you call medium or

small size. A lot of them are just mom-and-pops with, you know, 10 people, or five people, or 20 people. That's where the jobs are created. And if you tax the people that own those small businesses, you say, hey, that guy's making \$200,000 a year, we are going to—that's what Obama said in the campaign, hey, if you are making 250,000, look out because I am going to tax you, but anybody under 250, you are okay. Of course he wasn't telling the truth, because he had that tax that they were pushing on this global warming deal where if you flipped a light switch, you would start getting taxed. But aside from that, the fact is he wanted to tax heavily the people that own these small businesses. Guess what that's going to do to employment? It's the worst thing in the world. And then there is some other points, too.

I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well, thank you, Mr. AKIN, for yielding. And you are exactly right. Not only does excessive taxation kill the ability to do all the research and development that you were just talking about, but small business can't even buy inventory. So they can't sell their goods to consumers. The consumers don't have the money to come and buy the goods and services. So it kills the economy. It's just very, very simple economics.

The thing is we are going in the wrong direction. You talked about the energy tax that's been proposed, that NANCY PELOSI jammed through the House of Representatives here. It's what's called a regressive tax because it's going to hurt people on limited incomes and poor people the most. It's going to make their gasoline prices go up. In fact, I have heard many Democrats, many Democrats here on the floor of the House of Representatives say they would like to see gasoline at \$10 a gallon.

Now, somebody who is out working hard today trying to make a living, who is just making the house payment and paying their bills and just scraping to get by and trying to get by, if their gasoline price goes to \$10 a gallon, they are going to be just really out of economic luck, so to speak.

Mr. AKIN. How are you going to pay that mortgage payment now?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That's right. They can't afford their mortgage payment now, or some are just barely paying those things. And then the energy tax on their electricity when they flip on the light switch, or when their heating unit comes on, up North particularly. I, thankfully, live in the South, so we are more concerned about air conditioning.

A lot of old people in Georgia and Florida and all through the Southeast and through the Southwest are dependent upon air conditioning just to live. And if their electricity bills go sky high, as the energy tax is going to make it happen, if that ever passes, there are a lot of people that can't af-

ford to run their air conditioning anymore. And people are actually going to have a hard time with hyperthermia is what we call it in medicine as a medical doctor, which means their body temperature is going to go up, they are going to get dehydration, and people are going to have a lot of problems. And it's going to make a greater impact on our health care system and people are going to die because of that.

But it's going to kill jobs too. And it's going to be a job killer just like the ObamaCare that's been estimated by experts to kill over 5 million jobs in this country.

Mr. AKIN. Five million?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Over 5 million. Five and a half million, to be exact, jobs that health care taxes. And what it's going to do, is it's going to mean that a small business man or woman who is trying to just make a living, they are not going to be able to hire new employees because of ObamaCare. We have got to repeal and replace ObamaCare. And that's just the bottom line.

Everything that this Congress has done since I have been here 3 years now, everything, and all of it has been under NANCY PELOSI's leadership, everything that this Congress has done in 3 years that I have been here is going to kill jobs, it's going to kill our economy, and it's going to be killing the future of our children and grandchildren. We have just got to stop this.

Mr. AKIN. You didn't even mention that little small detail of the government becoming the master. The government is getting so big, the government employees are making so much money it's effectively becoming not the servant, but the master.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Absolutely. In fact, it's going to kill our freedom also.

Mr. AKIN. I am very concerned about our discussion tonight because I am afraid somebody may be watching and they are thinking, oh, my goodness, there isn't any hope, things are terrible and bad. Yeah, we are in a big financial mess because we have been doing the wrong policies. But I want to take about 10 minutes, I want to talk about let's wipe the slate clean. Let's stop all of this foolishness and let's talk about what we do to fix it. Because we can do that. I want to go first of all to my good friend—

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Could you yield just a half a second?

Mr. AKIN. Let's talk something positive.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am going to.

Mr. AKIN. Good.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. And I want to remind the gentleman that during our debate over ObamaCare we were accused as Republicans of being the party of no. We are the party of k-n-o-w. We know how to solve this economic downturn. We know how to create jobs. We know how to lower the costs of health care. We know how to create jobs in

the private sector instead of Big Government. We know how and are fighting to save freedom and to shrink the size of government, get government out of people's way so that they can run their lives without all this government intrusion. So we are the party of k-n-o-w. And I am excited about your launching into this idea about the solutions that we have.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I love talking about solutions, because you know what those solutions are about? Those solutions are about freedom. And that's a good word. And that's what America has always stood for. And that's what we need to talk about for a minute. But I do want to yield to my good friend, Congresswoman LUMMIS.

Mrs. LUMMIS. The Republican Study Committee has a proposal through JIM JORDAN's subcommittee on the economy that would balance the budget in 10 years. It would cut spending in areas other than homeland security and defense, and it does not touch Social Security. I am one of those who believe that we have to protect our entitlement system by reforming it rather than by leaving it alone. But let's save that discussion for another day.

Another proposal, one that I have with Representative SAM JOHNSON of Texas, would reduce the size of the Federal employment force through attrition. In other words, every time someone vacates a position through retirement or other means, that position would go into a position pool. And only those positions that are absolutely necessary to sustain the rolls of government as contemplated by the Constitution would be reclaimed and redeployed into the Federal employment force.

There are any number of ideas. The PAUL RYAN proposal, the JIM JORDAN proposal, this proposal. JEB HENSARLING has proposals, many that are comprehensive in nature that will provide that glide path to a better economy and do it without raising taxes.

So even though you hear frequently that the Republicans are being shortsighted in the fact that they do not want to consider tax increases as part of an economic recovery plan, you are correct that most of us don't. And the reason we don't is because we know we can recover this economy without raising taxes, and raising taxes will slow our ability to recover.

I yield back to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you for that insight and the wisdom that you have shared with us. This is a graph of actually what happens over time. And this is this effect I was talking about. You know, when you were flying those old-fashioned airplanes and you wanted to not drive your airplane into the dirt, what you had to do was push the stick forward, which would stop the spin. The plane would start to dive; but when you had control, you could pull the stick back. That seemed counter-intuitive.

Pilots for years would get in that graveyard spiral, and they would keep hitting the ground until this one crazy pilot said I am going to take my airplane up, I am going to put it in a graveyard spiral, and I have a solution, I believe, to pull it out of the spiral and live. So he bet his life on his solution. And he put it in the graveyard spiral, he pushed the stick forward, the plane stabilized, and then he eased the stick back, and the plane pulled out, and all the people on the ground went, whoa, that was a gutsy move.

That's a little counterintuitive. When you are out of control going down, your temptation is to jerk the stick up, which is what the Democrats are doing. They are raising taxes, making the situation worse, turning a recession into a depression. And what you have got to do is to learn from the pilots who had before you figured out how to do it. One of them, ironically, was JFK. Now, that guy's a Democrat, and they didn't learn from him. Because he was in a recession and he said less taxes, and the economy recovered.

Then a guy came along by the name of Ronald Reagan. He cut taxes like mad. Guess what happened? Recovery of the economy. Then comes along Bush. Cuts taxes. Recovery again. I mean, we have seen it over and over. Here it is and it's counterintuitive. Why in the world if you cut taxes could the government have more revenue and get the economy going?

Well, here is what happens. And think about it a little bit like this. Say you are king for a day, Congressman BROUN, you are king for a day and you are allowed to tax loaves of bread. And you are thinking in your mind now you have been technically trained as a doctor, you are a scientific thinker, and you have got these loaves of bread, how much are you going to tax a loaf of bread? First you think, huh, maybe a penny, because no one will notice a penny tax on a loaf of bread. Then you think, yeah, but if I taxed them more, I could get more money. So you say, huh, maybe \$10. Then you think, ah, no, maybe they wouldn't pay \$10 tax. So somewhere between \$10 and a penny there is an optimum tax to tax a loaf of bread to raise money for the government.

Well, the same kind of thing goes on on a larger scale. And what this guy Laffer understood was if you drop taxes, what happens is the economy gets going. When it gets going, there are more transactions. And so even a lower tax rate will generate more revenue.

So here is what he did. This is like that airplane. He is dropping taxes here, and take a look at government revenues. Government revenues are going up and taxes are down. That seems like making water run uphill, but it's not. Because when you get the economy going, then a lower tax rate actually generates more money. And that's the solution out of this problem.

So let's talk about what is it we have to do. We have to learn, if nothing else,

from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union had the philosophy that the government is going to give you health care, the government's going to give you an education, the government's going to provide for your retirement, it's going to give you housing and food. The government's going to do all of that. And we laughed. Because we said you can't—that socialism, that communism-socialism doesn't work. And yet what are we doing here? The same thing.

We are deciding the government's going to do health care, the government's going to do your education, the government's going to do your housing, and then the food stamps. It doesn't work. So what I think we understand is the government is just going to have to get out of the business of taking care of everybody and get back in the business of just simply managing the economy, providing for the national defense, and they are going to have to push all of that decision-making down to the State level and let the States do it. So we have to have a good breath of freedom and fresh air instead of the big Obama welfare state that we are doing.

Congressman BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. AKIN, I am a pilot, and I want to say that you are exactly right about getting out of a death spiral. So we do push the yoke forward to stop the spin, to stop the stall, to get the airplane flying again. And that's exactly what needs to happen to our economy, by pushing the stick forward, by reducing taxes, particularly on small businesses.

I introduced my JOBS Act. My JOBS Act is an acronym for "jump start our business sector." It would cut the taxes for business for 2 years. It would suspend capital gains taxes and dividend taxes. It would cut the two lowest income tax brackets down to 10 percent and 5 percent.

So if you think about it, that would leave dollars in the hands of business, leave dollars in the hands of consumers so that they would have the money to stimulate the economy. So it's something that would stimulate the economy and start creating jobs. And that is something that needs to happen. And it is by cutting taxes instead of raising taxes.

What we see here is our leadership here in the House, the Democratic leadership, wants to raise taxes. Our President wants to raise taxes. One thing that I want to go back to is something that you talked about when the President said he was going to raise taxes on people who made \$250,000 or more, that these are rich people. The vast majority of those folks are small business men and women who are filing their sub S corporations as personal income taxes. And those are really not their individual income, but that's how much money comes into their business.

□ 2030

So they're not just wealthy people who are living lavish lives. They are

men and women who are trying to make a living and create jobs and just take care of their families. So when we hear let's tax the rich, they need to pay more, actually what you're taxing people is out of jobs. You're killing the economy. You're taxing jobs. We need to lower taxes, and that's what you're fighting for.

Mr. AKIN. I really appreciate the gentleman for joining me tonight.

We, in a way, as Americans have got two choices here. One choice is the path to freedom, and the other path is the path of servitude to Big Brother government. Every solution that we've seen coming from the Democrats—now, we've seen an unusual year-and-a-half. I have been in Congress now 10 years. I've never seen a year-and-a-half like this. This is a total one-party rule. Almost every bill that passes, Democrats all vote one way, Republicans the other, and the Democrats have such a majority, and everywhere along the line they can do whatever they want and they have. And the solution is always more taxes, more government, and more government control.

So, on the one hand, you have the world of the Big Brother government taking care of things, and you're guaranteed that you can't fail because the government will always be there to bail you out, not just as a big corporation but as an individual. You can make bad choices. The government will be there to bail you out; that's what they promise, but it doesn't work that way.

In fact, what all of human history shows us is that one of the most dangerous things to human beings is big government because big government has killed more human beings than all the wars of history combined. Just take communism alone, which is a big government theory. Just communism alone has killed more people than all the wars since the time of Christ, and so this faith in big government is a very, very unlikely thing to put your faith in.

The other choice is freedom, the bright light and the fresh air of saying go out and do the best you can; you may fall on your face but get up and try again. That's what America was always founded on, the idea that government should just protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

My good friend, Congressman BROUN. Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you.

We have 1 minute left I think, and I just want to say that helping poverty is a very simple formula. It's a good-paying job and the education to fill that job. That's another thing that we know as Republicans. We've got to create those good-paying jobs, and the way we do that is in the private sector by reducing taxes on small business men and women so that they can create new jobs. We will continue to fight for freedom.

There's a wide gulf, just like you were saying, between the philosophies of the leadership of the Democrat

Party here and our leadership on our side. It is socialism on their hand. On our hand, it's freedom, personal responsibility, and accountability, and we're fighting for freedom and continue to do so.

Mr. AKIN. Freedom is a beautiful thing, but we have to realize there are a couple of things that come along with freedom. If you really want to be free, you're going to have to be responsible as well. You can't assume Big Brother government is going to do it all for you. The other thing is, if you want to be free, you have to tolerate the fact that other people near you may be successful. You have to suffer with some guy next door that's made millions of dollars and he gets to get in a fancy motorboat and ride around and maybe you'll feel jealous and even covetous of him. But that's freedom. You have to allow people to succeed, and you have to realize that you can also make a mistake and fail but you can have the freedom to get up and try again, but at least the government won't chain you down with regulations and bureaucracy and red tape and drive you into the dirt like an airplane that's not being flown right.

I thank you very much for joining me, Congresswoman LUMMIS and Congressman BROWN.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NYE). All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the recognition. I want to thank the minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER, for granting me the privilege of speaking here this evening.

What prompted us to come forward this evening is an announcement that took place before the Memorial Day weekend by the majority in the House, the Democratic majority leader and others, that it was not anticipated that they would be producing a budget. This is my 16th year in the Congress, and I know that that has not happened in the previous 15 years that I've served here. And in checking, I'm not aware, since the Budget Act of 1974 was enacted, that the House of Representatives hasn't put forth and produced a budget.

Just like at home, the reason that a budget is important is that it allocates resources and says what you're going to spend on what and, in the case of the government, what you're going to overspend and are going to have to borrow from places like China to finance the deficit and the debt. As a matter of fact, the news reports indicate that we

are projected to have a budget deficit—that's just spending more money this year than we have—of about \$1.4 trillion, which is certainly significant.

The thing about that debt, it's not money that we just have laying around or we borrow from the guy down the street. Most of it is borrowed from the financial institutions on Wall Street that we spend a lot of time bailing out and also foreign countries. China and others own a good portion of our debt as well.

So it was alarming that the announcement was made that we wouldn't be producing or the majority would not be producing a budget. Alarming because you wonder, maybe we've been really busy here and we haven't had time to get to something as important as the budget. And then, of course, after the budget is passed, that leads to what's called the appropriations process where the Appropriations Committee gets together and determines what we're going to spend on defense, what we are going to spend on education, what we are going to spend on the environment and so forth and so on. So, until you have the budget trigger, there's no allocation to the Appropriations Committee so they can begin their work.

So it's not just a matter of not having a blueprint, not having a budget; it's a matter of them not having the spending bills in place. Although, again, we're sometimes late in delivering those, it's pretty unusual that we don't even start the process with a markup in the subcommittees of Appropriations, certainly preparing the bills for floor activity.

In thinking about it, the President of the United States, President Obama, he's also charged with delivering a budget, and I think we all know that President Obama has been pretty busy. I mean, there's a lot going on. There have been a lot of things happening since he became the President of the United States that require attention. Some have been disasters; some have been financial difficulties. We've seen Greece go bankrupt on the other side of the ocean. But even as busy as President Obama has been, he discharged his statutory obligation and delivered to Capitol Hill in a timely fashion a budget. Now, you may not be crazy about the budget. You may think that the budget spends too much as I do, the President's proposal, but at least he did what he was supposed to do and present a budget.

That caused me to sort of examine what it is that we've been doing here in the House of Representatives or, more correctly, what the majority has decided we should be doing in the House of Representatives here since the beginning of the year to determine what it is that we have been so busy doing.

It's particularly important to talk about that a little bit because the first 12 years that I served in the Congress—I happen to be a Republican—there were more Republicans in the House of

Representatives than there were Democrats, and so we were the majority party and we determined what came to the floor, when it came to the floor, just like the Democratic majority does today. And we were doing such a bang-up job that in 2006 the voters replaced us and made the Democratic Party the majority party.

But one of the central themes of that campaign that the Democrats made all across the country was you need to put us in charge because the Republican Congress is a do-nothing Congress, they're just not doing anything. And, as a matter of fact, they indicated that we weren't working full time. Now, anybody that's been here knows that that's really a specious argument, a false argument, but it sold newspapers. It looked good on the talk shows when people would say, well, we're not even working a full week. Well, you know, some of the work is done here on the floor, a lot of the work is done in committee, a lot of the work is done back in our districts, but to say that we weren't here five days a week and they were going to change all that was an interesting campaign slogan.

But just walking over here, Mr. Speaker, I got a notice from the majority leader. We've just come back from our work period back in the district for Memorial Day. We didn't have any votes on Monday. We've done something called suspensions that I'm going to talk about the last couple of days, together with a bill that I guess we'll try and finish up tomorrow. But I just got an email, courtesy of the majority leader's office so that we know what our schedule should be, that we're not going to have any votes on Friday.

So, despite the fact that the Republican majority in 2006 was labeled as the do-nothing Congress and we didn't work 5 days a week, we have accomplished a whopping 3 days of floor activity here in the House of Representatives after being at home for Memorial Day for an entire week.

I thought to myself, well, maybe we should look to see what it is we've been doing because, clearly, if we're not producing a budget—and we're going to talk a little bit about other things that haven't been occurring around here—maybe we've been preoccupied with really, really important matters that needed to be addressed.

What I found out was, as I examined it, that there have been 337 recorded votes on something known as suspensions, and, you know, Mr. Speaker, but just so the record is clear, a suspension is a noncontroversial bill where it's cleared, usually by the majority who says to the minority, We'd like to do this on suspension. Most of those things are by agreement.

The way that works, it's called a suspension because you're suspending the rules, you're not bringing a bill to the floor pursuant to the regular order. You're bringing it in a way that's debated for 40 minutes. Each side gets 20 minutes, and then there's a recorded

vote if it's requested. And rather than the simple majority, it takes two-thirds of those Members present and voting to pass a suspension.

Now, the interesting thing about suspensions is that both parties file legislation that becomes suspensions, and there have been more suspensions than 337, but the 337 that have occurred since January of this year were those that actually required a recorded vote. So, for each one of the 337 suspensions with a vote, you had 40 minutes of debate, so 40 minutes of floor time plus a 15-minute vote.

Now, to be fair, when they put a series of the suspensions in a row, not every suspension gets a 15-minute vote; some get 5-minute votes. But also, there are very few, simply, 15-minute votes around here because Members have to come from committee or their offices or wherever they happen to be to cast their votes, and so at least the first vote in the series, it's not unusual, even though the clock runs down beginning at 15 minutes, that the actual time consumed is closer to half an hour.

So, just for a rule of thumb with that sort of asterisk, so you have 337 suspensions debated for 40 minutes apiece and each one getting a 15-minute vote, and we'll do the math in a little bit, but clearly, that's a significant amount of floor time in a Congress that's really only here 3 days a week discussing non-controversial bills.

In looking at the suspensions on this side, first of all, we have named 19 post offices or public buildings. And so, in each of those instances, a Member put forward a piece of legislation—and I don't make any observation about that these weren't worthy honors to name a public building after someone or a post office after someone, but 19 times the majority has put on the floor a suspension, consumed 40 minutes of time in a debate about whether or not we should—let's see, for instance, we designated a post office called the Roy Wilson Post Office, as an example, one time this year. So that bill was called up, debated for 40 minutes, and then there was a 15-minute vote. So, all told, just shy of an hour is consumed naming a post office after Mr. Wilson, and I will tell you that if you look up the recorded vote on that, I doubt that anybody that was present that day voted against it.

□ 2045

As a matter of fact, we just named two post offices earlier this evening, one after Ronald Reagan and the second one, I believe, was after a couple of Marines. Again, both are worthy designations, but there were no "no" votes.

So you sort of say to yourself, well, okay, then why did we have to have a recorded vote? Why did we have to consume 40 minutes of debate and then consume another 15 minutes on a vote when nobody was opposed to it and everybody thought it was a good idea?

As a matter of fact, you know, Mr. Speaker, that you could call up a post office bill and say, you know, "I want the post office" in wherever this happens to be—I apologize, I don't know—"but I want this post office named after Mr. Wilson," and ask everybody to vote for it and sit down.

And then the Speaker would say, "All those in favor, say, 'Aye.' All those opposed, 'No.'" And the ayes would obviously have it because everybody thinks it's a good idea. You wouldn't have a recorded vote. And I don't know how long that took, but it was a lot less than 55 minutes.

So, 19 times we consumed 55 minutes naming either a public building or a post office in honor of somebody.

The other thing I found was, in those 337 noncontroversial bills that each require 55 minutes, on over 30 occasions, I think it's 36 occasions, we congratulated a university or a college in this country for doing something like winning the lacrosse national championship or winning the NCAA basketball tournament.

And, again, all of the young people and all of those institutions deserve recognition. And I am not indicating, for example, that the University of Virginia men's soccer team, who won the 2009 Division I NCAA national championship—I know that every parent, every student on that team is extremely proud of his or her son's accomplishment in doing that.

But, again, if you look up the recorded vote, which was requested by the sponsor of that legislation, nobody voted against it. And so you have to say to yourself, well, okay, then why does it take 55 minutes on over 30 separate occasions since January of this year to congratulate all of these fine activities that have occurred?

And I only brought up the colleges and universities, but, in looking at the list, I know we have congratulated—and if I was a golfer, I could tell you, but we congratulated the guy who won the Masters, we congratulated a NASCAR race driver for winning his race.

And, again, all of those are important things, and I am sure that when the bills are finally passed and signed by the President, that makes a nice memento for that school or that individual to hang on their wall.

But when you are not doing other things such as producing a budget or producing a jobs bill that actually puts people back to work in this country, you have to ask yourself, well, why are you so busy taking 55 minutes times 36 to do that?

In addition, just sort of randomly, in pulling out some of the 337 suspensions that required a vote, because the majority asked for a vote, that don't have anything to do with schools and don't have anything to do with public buildings, you find that we are all about congratulating a lot of people who are engaged in certain activities in this country.

So, H. Res. 117, one of the first ones because 117 is kind of a low number, we supported the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. Now, again, if you look up the vote, you will find that everybody that was here that day voted to commend the fine engineers in this country because they were having a good week.

The next one, again in the low numbers, 197, we wanted to commend the American Sail Training Association for its advancement of character building under sail and for advancement of international goodwill.

Again, worthy goals, but you have to say, when you are not attending to the business of the people of the United States through legislation that makes a difference in their lives and you are making choices about limited floor time—because, again, we are not here 5 days a week; we are here, really, on an average, about 3 days a week, even though, when campaigning to become the majority, they indicated we are going to work 5 days a week—you wonder why that takes 55 minutes when everybody votes for it.

A lot of things dealing with education: We indicated that February the 1st was going to be National School Counselor Week. We recognized National Robotics Week. And I am not really sure what that is, but I am sure, I guess, we have a week dedicated to people who make robots. The only robots I have seen are those ones on TV that battle each other all the time. But, again, that take a lot of smarts to put together a good robot.

We had a week recognizing School Social Work Week. We supported the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week. And I guess that that means, you know, like, sewers and bridges and things like that, that we felt it was necessary to take 55 minutes to say that national works are good things.

We thanked Vancouver for hosting a wonderful Winter Olympics. And, again, when that came to a vote, I don't recall anybody in the House of Representatives voting against it. Certainly, people who saw the Olympics thought that that was a very nice Olympics. The American teams did better than they normally do during a Winter Olympics.

So, again, I don't have any big difficulty with the fact that one of our colleagues sat down and drafted a resolution to do any one of these 337 things. I think the question is: Why, unless you are making it appear that you are doing something, would you consume 435 Members, all of the wonderful staff that works here, why would with you consume all that time to do these things, when, instead, you could be dealing with things that people are concerned about?

So, I am not smart enough to do the math, but just for those that may be interested, that will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if you take out your calculator and indicate 337 for the suspensions where they have required a

vote, multiply it by 40 minutes, and then also multiply 337 times 15 minutes for the votes that occurred, that will give you the amount of floor time that has been consumed with these suspensions.

For instance, we recognized the importance of manufactured and modular housing. I think that that's important. I never lived in a modular house, but if I did, I am sure that I would think that it was a good thing to honor the people that made it so that it didn't fall in on me, and we should recognize them.

But, again, why do you have to take an hour on the floor of the greatest deliberative body of the world to congratulate or recognize people who are in the modular home industry rather than dealing with other things?

And let me just talk for a minute about what those other things are. I mentioned the budget. No one around here can recall a time since the Budget Act of 1974 when the House of Representatives has not produced a budget.

Everybody at home, certainly in my part of the world in Ohio, when they sit down and figure out, you know, okay, we were sending the kids to school and it's going to cost this much, the car payment is this much, insurance is this much, you have to budget it. And if you don't budget it, you run into trouble. And then the trouble you run into is you either don't know what's going on with your finances or you spend more money than you have. And that's certainly the case with the Federal Government.

But one way that people that were here long before I got here decided that you could, sort of, track that and keep an eye on it was to produce a budget. And it also is a good tool for our constituents because there is a lot of concern about how much money is being spent in this country.

However, Americans tend to be generous people. Americans also recognize the importance of national defense. And if you said to my constituents or any constituents that, "Look, we have to spend more money than we are bringing in in tax revenues this year, but here is what we are spending it on, because you can look at our budget," then sometimes people would say, "Well, okay, I mean, borrowing money is not a good idea, but if we are going to borrow money, at least we understand that you are going to borrow it for"—for instance, there is a horrible situation going on in the Gulf of Mexico, with the oil literally gushing out of the bottom of the ocean.

And if you have seen the pictures of the wildlife and you recognize that hurricane season is about to hit the gulf and, you know, when that water gets stirred up, the damage and the oil is going to spread much further than it has today, there are a number of people who would say, "Well, okay, borrowing money is not a great idea. Maybe we would prefer that you go find cuts someplace else to pay for it. But we understand that emergencies happen, and

so if you need to spend X millions of dollars to deal with that situation and then hopefully get it repaid from BP or those responsible for the mess that has been created down there, we think that that's okay."

But without a budget, we not only deprive Members of the Congress from understanding where it is we are going fiscally, we also deprive all the people that are paying the bills, the taxpayers of the United States, from knowing how the government proposes to spend their money in the next fiscal year.

And it's a fiscal year, Mr. Speaker—and I know you know this, but I will indicate it just for the record—that the Federal Government's fiscal year goes October 1st to October the 1st. And so these things need to be in place by October 1st, both budget and the appropriations process, the spending process, or else calamitous things happen. The government shuts down, there is no predictability about how things are going to be spent, and it's a mess. And it's certainly not the preferred way of governing.

And, as a matter of fact, there are a number of statements made by gentlemen who now hold the position of majority leader or chairman of the Budget Committee who, when they were in the minority party and it was the Republicans' job to cobble together a budget and get it passed, which we always did, they indicated in words to the effect that the inability or the failure to create a budget is a failure to govern.

And, you know, words are funny things, just like when you say we should work 5 days a week and we wind up working 3 days a week, but the reason that you said we should work 5 days a week is to say that other people are bad, that can come back and bite you in the nose.

And, similarly, when you make statements like, you know, "The failure to produce a budget is a failure to govern," when you are in the criticism business rather than the governing business, and then all of a sudden the voters put you in charge, and they say, "Well, we are not even going to try to do a budget," it gets you into trouble.

You know, one of the dissatisfactions, one of the many dissatisfactions—and you are seeing it in election after election across the country—is that people think that the Federal Government has stopped listening to them and their representatives have stopped listening to them. And I happen to think one of the biggest contributors to that is this venomous partisanship that goes back and forth.

And, you know, you have to recognize that, when you are in the minority and you are making a statement that the failure to produce a budget is a failure to govern, well, sometimes, you know, the dog catches the car. And you then are put in a position where it's your job to craft the budget. And so, what are we to think if you don't produce a budget? I think you are to think that it's a failure to govern.

And, rather than saying that, it would be my preferred path that we would work together, Republicans and Democrats. Just because a Democrat has an idea, I don't dismiss it as a bad idea because it came from a Democrat. And my Republican colleagues, a lot of them are very bright people and they have very good ideas that, if they were incorporated into some of the things that the majority was up to, perhaps we could have legislation.

And that's always been, you know, how I have tried to conduct myself in the 16 years I have been here. And the proof is sort of in the pudding. And the National Journal, one of the publications here on Capitol Hill, sort of looks at how Members of Congress vote. And there was an article, about a month and a half ago, that talked about who voted either for or against the clearly identified initiatives of President Obama the most.

□ 2100

And so, not untypically, the numbers were pretty high on the Republican side in opposing some of the things that President Obama is putting forward; and again, not surprisingly because the President is a Democrat, the members of the Democratic Party voted for his proposals in pretty large amounts. But I was surprised—and I think I'm probably lucky I didn't get a primary from a tea party person because that analysis showed that on 65 percent of the occasions where President Obama identified what his goal or priority was, I supported President Obama. That's a pretty high number. It wasn't the highest among Republicans, I think it was fifth or sixth, but that's what I'm talking about.

The way that things work and the way you govern is when you take the best ideas of a lot of bright people here, a lot of good-intentioned people here, and craft something that maybe you don't get everything you want—the only two people that I ever knew or do know that were right 100 percent of the time were my mother and my wife. And I know that because they both told me they were right 100 percent of the time.

So, again, you have to say to yourself, what are we doing? Why are we spending an hour times 337 honoring football teams and lacrosse teams and swimming teams and recognizing the—well, we did modular housing. Let's see, what else did we do? We honored a historic community and expressed condolences to the Chatham County Courthouse. Again, I don't know what horrible event befell the Chatham County Courthouse, but we took an hour here doing that rather than doing other things.

And so what is it that we haven't accomplished, and what is it that the American people, I think, would appreciate if we got around to it? The first I indicated—and I apologize, Mr. Speaker, my writing is bad and it looks like chicken scratch—but the first is a budget, and I think I've talked enough

about the fact that we haven't produced a budget.

Another thing, 12 years I spent on the Transportation Committee around here, and every 6 years we have reauthorized something known as the Surface Transportation bill. It was called ICE-TEA in 1991, it was called TEA-21 in 1997, it was called SAFETEA-LU in 2005, and it expired last September. Now, that legislation is what funnels literally billions of dollars to the States so that they can build roads and bridges and make safety improvements and build bike lanes and a whole host of other things.

But aside from being a bill that keeps our country competitive—because it really started, even though we have a 6-year bill now, it started in 1956, I believe, with Dwight Eisenhower when he decided we should have a dedicated gasoline tax and built the national highway system. And if you think about the national highway system and what it has meant to this country in terms of commerce, it's unbelievable. Even if you go beyond commerce, you have to say to yourself, wait a minute, it's also a big item in national defense.

So you would think that that would be something we would like to take care of. As a matter of fact, the rule of thumb on the Transportation Committee was that for every \$1 billion that was expended in that legislation, it created 47,500 jobs. Republicans now are asking where is the budget, but before that we were asking where are the jobs.

The job figures, Mr. Speaker, you know, came out last week. There was an uptick in employment, but included in that uptick in employment was the fact that the government has hired 400,000 people to conduct the census. Now, anybody who is interested can go back and see how many people were hired to conduct the census in 2000. It's an important job. But 400,000 people were hired to conduct the census, counting all the people in the United States of America.

When you take out the 400,000 government jobs that were created temporarily—and again, if you're talking about jobs, a job to me is something where you can earn a wage, have health care security, have retirement, potentially, and the ability through that wage to support yourself and your family on a long-term basis. Very, very few people would consider it to be just a sweetheart job, to get a job counting people in the United States and then being done and not being employed when you're done with that.

So if you look at the jobless figures and you take out the 400,000 people that have been added to conduct the census, job unemployment in this country is stagnant. It's hovering between 9 and 10 percent. We've been joined by my good friend, Mr. McCOTTER of Michigan. Michigan has been hard hit because of the auto industry. The gentleman from Michigan can tell us in a minute what that unemployment is.

But, again, by recognizing National Teachers Day and taking an hour of time to do that, we haven't gotten to the transportation bill. It's about a year overdue; it will be soon. We keep kicking the can down the road, but it's not being done. So if your question is, where are the jobs? How can the government assist? The government doesn't create jobs—unless you're a census worker. But how can we assist, sort of give the economy a boost? And under this administration we've had stimulus 1, we've had stimulus 2, we've had bailout 1, 2 and 3, son of bailout, son-in-law of bailout; and we still hover around 9 or 10 percent unemployment across the country.

What is significant about the transportation bill is that the people—although the 47,500 jobs that are created for each billion of spending are on a wide array of things—the people that cook food and serve it to highway workers in restaurants, the people in the uniform business that produce or clean uniforms for the people out building roads and bridges, the people that make the orange cones and the reflective vests—the bulk of the highway work is done by laborers and operating engineers and designed by civil engineers.

Well, their unemployment rate, the unemployment rate in the trades isn't 9 or 10 percent. Depending upon what trade you're talking about, the unemployment rate is between 27 and 40 percent. So these people who have had jobs—we're not talking about people that don't want to work or anything else—these people who have had jobs, because of the shrinking of the economy and because of Congress' failure to act on a transportation bill—which was due last September, it's not like it was last week and we just sort of skipped over it and didn't quite get there from here—it's almost a year late.

And there are really no prospects, despite the really good intentions of a guy named JIM OBERSTAR, who is the chairman, a Democrat from Minnesota, of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. If it was up to him, we would have had a transportation bill on time, but it's not up to him. The leadership of the House has indicated that we're just not going to do a transportation bill between now and certainly the election. And the President's Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, has indicated that the administration has decided that they want to go on an 18-month listening tour to listen to ideas about transportation and has no intention of even addressing the highway bill until March of next year.

And so at that point it's going to be 1½ years late before the bill is even hobbled together. And bills just don't all of a sudden spring up like crocuses here in the spring. There have to be some hearings and adjustments and amendments, and then it's brought to the floor for floor activity.

So when we are spending an hour times 337 doing things like, oh, I don't

know, in support of National Safe Digging Week, we spent an hour on that—nobody voted against it, but in order to make it look like we were here 5 days a week, to make it look like we were doing something, we spent an hour both discussing and voting on National Safe Digging Week. Now, I don't know exactly what National Safe Digging Week is, but I think it's when you go out in your back yard and you want to put in a garden, you should call the utilities first and not stick the spade in the ground or else you're going to cut your neighbor's gas line. So I think that's National Safe Digging Week.

But regardless, again, I'm not aware of any big push by anybody that would condemn National Safe Digging Week, and I certainly have never seen a resolution around here that wanted to promote National Unsafe Digging Week. But we took an hour, we took an hour, rather than producing a budget so that we could, in an orderly fashion, figure out where we are in this country financially.

Instead of just borrowing trillions and trillions of dollars that we don't have, we could have been doing a transportation bill for a sector that, unlike the 9 or 10 percent—which is really high all by itself, and if you sort of flashback to February of 2009, the President's observation was we have to do this \$800 billion of stimulus spending because if we don't, unemployment is going to go above eight percent. Well, the economy is an unpredictable thing, and I certainly don't fault the President for—or his advisers actually, I don't think the President actually sat down and crunched the \$800 billion—but you certainly can't fault him and his advisers for thinking that was the case.

But the fact of the matter is it hasn't been the case, and unemployment has risen, cresting double digits; and now it's not getting better unless we spend more money hiring people—400,000 people—to count people in the census.

Maybe the gentleman from Michigan could just share with us briefly what the economic picture is and what's of concern to his constituents in the State of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCOTTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You bring up a very sore point for the people of Michigan: we have the highest unemployment rate in the country. We've suffered greatly in what many people believe has been our longest lasting recession. And at present, they are very concerned that not only will we not see an immediate recovery or one in the near future, but instead what we will see is another dip down into the recession with inflation following it due to, as the gentleman has pointed out, the massive borrowing by the Federal Government. This would be akin to the stagflation that Michigan experienced in the late seventies and early eighties, which was a very severe

blow to our economy and to the families and the workers that rely upon a strong manufacturing base in this country.

When you talk about the budget, when you talk about the transportation bill, these are essential items of the Federal Government. Not being able to bring forward a budget, as the gentleman has rightly pointed out, leaves individuals who could make investments and who could help grow the economy to feel that the fiscal discipline and fiscal integrity in the United States is absent. This will then preclude them from stepping forward and trying to help grow the economy, to help people find jobs, especially in my home State of Michigan.

We talk about transportation, which is something that has generally been very bipartisan. This is not an ideological debate. We understand there is a Federal role. As Republicans, we know this from starting with Abraham Lincoln's support for internal improvements, and yet for whatever reason we have not seen a bill come forth.

As the gentleman has also rightly pointed out, the people of Michigan—who would be interested in such a bill, I assure you—are hearing that there will instead be a listening tour. Well, if you haven't heard them by now, they want jobs, they want the opportunities, they want to see the economy grow, and they want to see the Federal Government actually taking responsible steps to help facilitate economic growth.

I think that as we continue to go through the list of items that the gentleman has put forward, we do not criticize colleagues for voting on what's put in front of them. People have long talked about the bills or the resolutions that Congress passes. There are constituencies who like them. There are very few, as has been pointed out, very few individuals who oppose them. But if you look at it like a meal, on the blue charts that the gentleman from Ohio has put forward are what I would call the fixings, and what is on the white board that is missing is the actual meat and potatoes.

This Congress has to understand that there are families worried about their finances, they're worried about their futures, they're worried about what next meal they will put on the table if they lose their job or if their unemployment runs out, or if we go into a double-dip recession with the prospect of stagflation.

It is up to this Congress not necessarily to say that all the fixings are irrelevant, but we should be able to put a full meal forward of legislative priorities, pass them, and help to get us out of the situation that we're in. I know that in a State with 14 percent unemployment, that would be a most welcome change to what we're experiencing now.

I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for those observations. Again,

it's tough for you to see, so I just want to elevate this chart for a minute. But two of my favorites that we've spent an hour on is H. Res. 1294, expressing support for the designation of National Explosive Ordnance Disposal Day.

□ 2115

Now, I guess that means, you know, if you live next-door to a Korean War vet and if he smuggled home a couple of grenades and he has them in your basement that we are honoring the getting rid of those without blowing people up. Again, at a time when we haven't done a budget and we haven't done a transportation bill, the fact that we would spend an hour of time here coming up with honoring people who dispose of unsafe ordnances is a strange thing.

We've been joined now by my great friend from Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, of Columbus, Ohio.

You know, a lot of people point to the collapse of the subprime market and to the fact that we weren't on the ball when it came to the residential housing market. You can go back and forth. You can blame the Republicans, you can blame the Democrats, but the blame game really doesn't matter much.

The gentleman talked about a second recession. We do know that the mortgage market for a commercial property is about to explode. We have seen it. We see it coming. We know it's coming. Basically, what has occurred is because of the difficulties in the economy. Just as an example, if you were in the real estate business and if you purchased a building, an office building, and if it were fully rented—everybody pays you rent—but you bought it for \$1 million and today it's not worth \$1 million, the banks, which we've bailed out again and again and again, are now in the process of saying to the people who own those buildings, Well, wait a minute. We can't finance that for \$1 million anymore because it's only worth \$600,000. We know that that is coming. We know it.

Again, we are passing bills about the safe, you know, disposal—not even the safe disposal of hand grenades. We're just honoring people for having a week when they dispose of hand grenades.

You know, with the last one down here, H. Res. 1301, we supported the goals and ideals of National Train Day. That's about the fifth time that I can recall since the Democrats became the majority that we have recognized National Train Day. I happen to like trains. I support trains and so forth and so on. Yet how come we spent an hour of time and 337 hours of time having bills and having votes when everybody votes for them rather than dealing with this commercial mortgage crisis? I mean, where is the bill that does that?

What you will get instead is inaction. We'll honor, you know, a couple more universities for winning a swim meet or a curling tournament, and we'll not

deal with the commercial mortgage crisis. Then we're going to start the blame game all over again. We're going to say, Well, it happened on your watch. It's George Bush's fault. It's Barack Obama's fault. How about, rather than honoring trains, we take an hour of our valuable time here and we do something about a crisis that we know is coming?

I yield to my friend from Ohio for his thoughts.

Mr. TIBERI. Well, I thank the gentleman from northeastern Ohio and the Cleveland suburbs in Lake County for organizing this hour today, and I think you've really hit on some of the important points.

When you kind of go back over a year ago when the stimulus bill was passed by the majority, the Speaker said that unemployment wouldn't go above 8 percent. Boy, it would be nice to see unemployment at 8 percent in Ohio at this time, wouldn't it? It would be nice to see unemployment at 8 percent in my district. It would be nice to see 8 percent unemployment in your district. It would be nice to see unemployment even close to 8 percent nationally, and we don't see that today. In fact, as someone who has a father factoring the last time unemployment was above 8 percent, which was in the early 1980s—he lost his job and lost his pension, and we lost our health care—it's kind of *deja vu* all over again.

Rather than try to focus on those issues, we have spent a whole lot of time on issues that don't employ people, that don't make a difference in people's lives. Maybe they are important, but not as important as dealing with the nuts-and-bolts issues that you've talked about tonight.

I mean, if you can't budget, you can't govern, one man said, who is now the chairman of the Budget Committee from South Carolina. If you can't budget, you can't govern. Maybe you've already said this, but, since 1974, the House has never passed a budget. This year, the Democratic majority is not going to pass a budget in this House of Representatives. If you can't pass a budget, you can't govern. By the way, for the 6 years that I was in the majority here, we didn't have a 78-Member majority like the Democrats do today. This is unbelievable.

I was knocking on doors in my district in central Ohio and in Columbus on Saturday. Americans are mad and they are struggling. They are scared and they are concerned. Those who have the ability to expand their businesses—and there are some employers, job creators who have the ability—are frightened. They are frightened. I don't know if you talked about this before I came. They are frightened at the prospects of higher taxes. They are frightened at the prospects of more regulation. So what are they doing? They are kind of retracting and are not doing what they could be doing, which is creating jobs, obviously.

Rather than being on the floor here to honor somebody who is going to

have a courthouse named after him, which might be worthy, let's focus on these issues that you've talked about that are vitally important. We have an election in 5 months. Between now and then, nobody who I talked to in central Ohio who is a job creator, who is an entrepreneur, who is a risk-taker, is willing to take that risk based upon what they see coming out of this Congress.

So the gentleman from northeastern Ohio is correct in saying that it is not the roadmap that we need to be on to make our economy better in the greatest country in the world. We have too much debt, too many taxes, and too much spending. What we need to be doing is just the opposite of what the majority is doing today.

I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for that.

I just want to give credit to somebody who is in the Chamber with us. He can't speak because he happens to be the Speaker pro tem, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK), and he is presiding over the House for this Special Order.

When you talk about commercial real estate, he has got a plan. I mean, he has put together some very bright people to help avert what he sees and what everybody in this Chamber should see, if they don't see, which is that we are headed for this big fall off the cliff in commercial real estate, which will make the housing market, the residential housing crisis, really—and you're talking about millions and millions of dollars per building.

Go ahead.

Mr. TIBERI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I'd be happy to.

Mr. TIBERI. Just last week, back in central Ohio, as we were home during the Memorial Day recess week, I convened a meeting—and I'm a former Realtor, a recovering Realtor. We had real estate folks on the commercial real estate side. We had small businesses. We had business or building managers, building owners and managers and bankers in the meeting.

To your point, they said that the commercial real estate market, if Congress doesn't deal with this issue soon, is going to make the housing meltdown look like minor league compared to what could happen on the commercial real estate side, not just in Ohio but across the country. This is happening very, very soon.

As we deal with this financial regulatory bill that is coming soon, which is in conference committee today, that could actually add to this problem by restraining credit and by creating a bigger problem with respect to access to capital. In this Congress today, with the majority, we are really heading for a disaster of epic proportions if we don't deal with this.

So I am pleased that Representative MINNICK is on the case. I am pleased that you are on the case, and I hope that some folks can get to the leader-

ship on the Democratic side to actually do something about this before it is too late.

I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman.

Here are three quick examples of things that we haven't done that could, one, make sure we don't spend more than we are supposed to and, two, that could deal with the sector of the economy workforce that is not facing 10 percent or 13 percent or 15 percent unemployment but that is facing, rather, 27 percent to 40 percent unemployment. We're not looking forward, as the current resident of the Chair, Mr. MINNICK, is, to averting another meltdown for which we will again engage in a lot of finger pointing: It's this person's fault or it's that person's fault.

The gentleman from Ohio, I know, serves on the Ways and Means Committee, and the other side of this is not just what haven't we done in terms of action, but there are a number of things that are set to expire that have to do with job creation, and I'll ask the gentleman to address some of those in just a second.

Again, referring to the list, rather than dealing with these issues or with the issues that we are going to talk about in a minute, we spent an hour here in the House of Representatives expressing the support of the week of April 18 through April 23 as National Assistant Principals Week.

Now, you know, there are a lot of things that honor teachers, school counselors, so forth and so on. I don't know what my friend's experiences were, but it was the assistant principal you would see when you went to get spanked, when I was growing up, because you were misbehaving. So I'm trying to figure out, you know, of all of the people we honor—and I suppose I voted for it as did everybody when the roll was called; but you know, assistant principals, I'm not so sure, are up there with everybody else.

I'll yield to the gentleman from Ohio to talk a little bit about what are affectionately called the "Bush tax cuts." What we're talking about is the tax legislation that was enacted in 2001 and 2003. They are characterized by our friends on the other side of the aisle as tax breaks for filthy rich people, but maybe you could go through a few of them, and we could identify them, because I think they go from cradle to grave.

What is about to expire? People are going to pay higher rates on what?

Mr. TIBERI. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding on this matter and for bringing this up because we've spent a lot of hours on issues right behind you that are not life-or-death issues.

Just a couple weeks ago, we spent less than an hour on an issue that deals with tax increases for people who own partnerships. Quite honestly, the way the majority sold it was we're going to tax people who are hedge fund part-

ners. Yet the reality is, if you look at what the Congressional Budget Office said, in going back to your point about commercial real estate, the U.S. Conference of Mayors expressed grave concern about what the majority Democratic Party was doing with respect to carried interest. Real estate partnerships are the most impacted group, and we're going to take their real estate partnership and go from 15 percent to ordinary income.

So, next year, which is what you just said based upon the tax cuts expiring, the marginal rates going up, the rate increase and the payroll tax for health care, you're going to see a huge increase in people who invest in our cities, in commercial real estate. At the same time that this problem is going to occur that you've already explained, you're going to see tax increases from 15 percent to over 40 percent for some people.

What the Conference of Mayors understands, which is not exactly a conservative group in any way, shape or form, is that, if you're going to increase taxes on people who invest in our cities from 15 percent to over 40 percent, they're not going to invest in our cities. This is a huge impact, even before those tax cuts expire at the end of this year.

What will happen next year is we're going to see capital gains rates go up. We're going to see dividends go up. We're going to see marginal rates go up—close to 40 percent for the top tax group. As the gentleman from northeastern Ohio knows, before all of these tax rates go up, we have already seen 53 percent of Americans today pay Federal income tax. There are 47 percent of Americans who don't, and that is going to get worse when these tax cuts expire. So you are close to a situation where you have more people actually in the wagon than are pulling the wagon rather than people pulling the wagon than are in the wagon. This is not a good situation for America.

My mom and dad came to America for a better life, for the American Dream, for an opportunity, and that is slowly slipping away for so many people under this Democratic majority where it's class warfare every step of the way. When these tax cuts expire, it's more of that class warfare—the haves versus the have-nots—and it's a bad, bad recipe for the future of America if we continue this class warfare argument, whether it's on income, whether it's on capital gains and dividends, whether it's targeting the job creators and the entrepreneurs versus the people in America who aren't.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, to the gentleman's point, you mentioned a variety of tax provisions that are set to expire. I want to focus on two—interest and dividends.

So any senior citizen who is living on a fixed income, who receives his or her income as a result of investments that he or she makes and who receives interest income if he or she is invested in

the stock market or in some other fund and he or she gets dividends as a result of that, currently, under the current law, what is the rate that that senior pays on his or her interest and dividends?

Mr. TIBERI. Fifteen percent.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Okay. Now, what's going to happen when the majority party indicates that it is not going to take any action?

Again, as they're not on the budget, as they're not on the transportation bill, as they're not on the commercial real estate side, when they fail to take action to extend those, the senior citizens who today are paying 15 percent on the money they earn in interest and on the money that they earn in dividends, what is their tax rate going to be?

Mr. TIBERI. The capital gains and dividend rate will go up to 20 percent, and depending on what rate they are on, that marginal rate will go up as well.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Okay. So, you know, some of my favorite discussions here are semantics, so we're going to hear that because people who raise taxes repeatedly usually don't get re-elected because people aren't real crazy about that. So we'll hear, We're not raising anybody's taxes. We're just letting this set of tax rates expire. Okay. But, you know, if I've made 100 bucks in interest and today the tax on that is \$15 and it's going to go up to at least \$20 that then I'll have to pay, I have a tough time, and I would really have a tough time explaining to the common-sense people whom we represent in Michigan and Ohio how that is not a tax increase.

□ 2130

But, with a straight face, there are people who will come down to the well of this House and say, "We're not raising anybody's taxes. We just let these taxes expire."

And I see the discussion of taxes has once again gotten the gentleman from Michigan on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. McCOTTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding on your point about how the proponents of the tax increases going up, tax rates going up, will say that they really didn't do anything, that they just simply let the tax relief expire.

This is akin to coming upon an accident scene and saying, "Well, I did not help the victim. I merely let them expire."

I yield back.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank you.

The Chair tells us we have about a minute and 45 seconds, and I'd just yield to my friend from Ohio for any closing observations that he has.

Mr. TIBERI. Well, I thank the gentleman.

You know, the bottom line is there are a lot of people in our State that are hurting. There are a lot of people in Ohio that would like a job. There are a lot of people in Michigan that would like a job.

Looking back over the last year, we have spent a lot of time on energy and cap-and-trade and health care and stimulus. And the bottom line is, ever since we spent that time, more and more people in Ohio and Michigan are out of work. We have record unemployment, record unemployment going back to when I was in high school back in the early 1980s, with no end in sight.

And then, on top of that, we have tax increases coming. We have spending out of control. We have spending that is higher than I've ever seen. Even the high spending that we thought we saw a couple of years ago is minor league compared to the spending today.

And Americans are getting it. And all the time that we've spent on the legislation that you've talked about that is not really important in people's lives is starting to penetrate to the American people, to Ohioans and to Michiganders, that we need to be tackling some of these tough issues.

How do you tackle these tough issues, sir, without passing a budget? And that's the bottom line.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, that's right.

And it's interesting, this special order, we have people from Ohio and Michigan. And at least each November we don't get along very well, but on this issue we're very united. And I thank both of you for participating, Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. TIBERI.

And, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHIFF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BALDWIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 16.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 16.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 16.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today and June 10.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first and second quarters of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GEORGIA, BANGLADESH, PAKISTAN, AND UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 2, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Price	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00
	3/28	3/30	Bangladesh		536.00						536.00
	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		575.00						575.00
	4/02		United Kingdom								
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00
	3/28	3/30	Bangladesh		536.00						536.00
	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		99.00						99.00
	4/01	4/02	United Kingdom		485.00						485.00
Hon. Stephen Lynch	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00
	3/28	3/30	Bangladesh		536.00						536.00
	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		640.00						640.00
	4/01	4/02	United Kingdom		485.00						485.00
Hon. Jim McDermott	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GEORGIA, BANGLADESH, PAKISTAN, AND UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 2, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John Lis	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		640.00						640.00
	4/01	4/02	United Kingdom		485.00						485.00
	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00
	3/28	3/30	Bangladesh		536.00						536.00
Rachael Leman	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		640.00						640.00
	4/01	4/02	United Kingdom		485.00						485.00
	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00
	3/28	3/30	Bangladesh		536.00						536.00
Asher Hildebrand	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		640.00						640.00
	4/01	4/02	United Kingdom		485.00						485.00
	3/27	3/28	Georgia		348.00						348.00
	3/28	3/30	Bangladesh		536.00						536.00
Committee total	3/30	4/01	Pakistan		640.00						640.00
	4/01	4/02	United Kingdom		485.00						485.00
Committee total					12,436.00						12,436.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE, May 14, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HAITI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED ON MAY 7, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Price	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. David Dreier	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Donald Payne	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Mazie Hirono	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Lynn Woolsey	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Bobby Rush	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Brad Miller	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
John Lis	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Dave Grimaldi	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Margarita Seminario	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Brad Smith	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Asher Hildebrand	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Rachael Leman	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Deanne Samuels	5/07	5/07	Haiti		10.00						10.00
Committee total					170.00						170.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE, May 14, 2010.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the

vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 5026, the Grid Reliability and Infrastructure De-

fense Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5026, THE GRID RELIABILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEFENSE ACT, AS AMENDED

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2020
	Net Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit											
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

^a H.R. 5026 would amend existing law regarding the regulation of electric power transmission facilities. Under this amended version of the bill, the Tennessee Valley Authority and Bonneville Power Administration would be exempt from certain requirements in the bill for an 11-year period beginning on the date of enactment. As a result, CBO estimates that enacting the legislation would have a negligible effect on net direct spending over the 2010–2020 period.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7814. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program (RIN: 0570-AA71) received May 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7815. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0268; FRL-8826-4]

received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7816. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diquat Dibromide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0920; FRL-8827-7] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7817. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Novaluron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0273; FRL-8825-3] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7818. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prothioconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0279; FRL-8828-6] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7819. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Letter Contract Definitization Schedule (DFARS Case 2007-D011) received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7820. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Trade Agreements Thresholds (DFARS Case 2009-D040) (RIN: 0750-AG59) received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7821. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Limitations on Procurements with Non-Defense Agencies (DFARS Case 2009-D027) (RIN: 0750-AG67) received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7822. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General David A. Deptula, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7823. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Douglas E. Lute, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7824. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7825. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the National Security Strategy of the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7826. A letter from the Officer Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Health Service Act, Rural Physician Training Grant Program, Definition of "Underserved Rural Community" (RIN: 0906-AA86) received May 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7827. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Florida; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards for the Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and Southeast Florida Areas [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0612-200914(a); FRL-9155-3] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7828. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R02-OAR-2010-0131; FRL-9146-4] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7829. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; State of North Dakota; Air Pollution Control Rules, and Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 1997 PM_{2.5} and 8-hour Ozone NAAQS: "Significant Contribution to Non-attainment" and "Interference with Prevention of Significant Deterioration" Requirements [EPA-R08-OAR-2009-0282; FRL-9155-6] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7830. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution Revisions for the 1997 8-hour Ozone NAAQS: "Significant Contribution to Non-attainment" Requirement [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-103 2; FRL-9155-5] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7831. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Transportation Conformity Regulations [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0320; FRL-9156-2] received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7832. A letter from the Chairman, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), pursuant to Public Law 104-191, section 263 (110 Stat. 2033); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7833. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-046, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7834. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-043 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7835. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-032, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7836. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report pursuant to the U.S. Policy in Iraq Act, Section 1227(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (P.L. 109-163) as amended by Section 1223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110-181) and Section 1213(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110-417); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7837. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2010 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and in accordance with Section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7838. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the na-

tional emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7839. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Auditor's Review of Environmental Standards Requirements Pursuant to the Compliance Unit Establishment Act of 2008", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7840. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Auditor's Review of Compliance with Certified Business Enterprises Requirements Pursuant to the Compliance Unit Establishment Act of 2008", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7841. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2010 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7842. A letter from the Deputy Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NARA Facility Locations and Hours [FDMS Docket NARA-10-0002] (RIN: 3095-AB66) received May 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7843. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the South Carolina Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7844. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting A report on the use of HIDTA funds to investigate and prosecute organizations and individuals trafficking in methamphetamine in the prior calendar year, pursuant to 120 Stat. 3523; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7845. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30724; Amdt. No. 3373] received May 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7846. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30723; Amdt. No. 3372] received May 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7847. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting The Agency's final rule — Withdrawal of Federal Antidegradation Policy for all Waters of the United States within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania [EPA-HQ-OW-2007-93; FRL-9156-5] (RIN: NA2040) received May 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7848. A letter from the Office Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems for Acute Care Hospitals and Fiscal Year 2010 Rates and to the Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective

Payment System and Rate Year 2010 Rates: Final Fiscal Year 2010 Wage Indices and Payment Rates Implementing the Affordable Care Act [CMS-1406-N] (RIN: 0938-AQ03) received May 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7849. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting 2010 National Drug Control Strategy, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 1504; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Homeland Security, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Oversight and Government Reform, Small Business, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 5486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 5487. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 5488. A bill to require each authorized public chartering agency to publish on the Internet the financial expenditures of each charter school that is authorized or approved by such agency and receives Department of Education funding; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRIGHT:

H.R. 5489. A bill to amend section 14102(a)(1)(A) of title 40, United States Code, to provide that Bullock County, Alabama, is included in the definition of the Appalachian region for purposes of Appalachian regional development; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 5490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against excise taxes with respect to distilled spirits and wine for certain distilled spirits or wine produced from domestic agricultural waste or byproducts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 5491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit for taxpayers with long-term care needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WATT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 5492. A bill to permit expungement of records of certain nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5493. A bill to provide for the furnishing of statues by the District of Columbia for display in Statuary Hall in the

United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5494. A bill to direct the Director of the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain properties to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 5495. A bill to build capacity and provide support at the leadership level for successful school turnaround efforts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5496. A bill to repeal the public telecommunications facilities assistance program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an individual to designate \$3 on their income tax return to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. McMAHON):

H. Res. 1428. A resolution recognizing Brooklyn Botanic Garden on its 100th anniversary as the preeminent horticultural attraction in the borough of Brooklyn and its longstanding commitment to environmental stewardship and education for the City of New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 1429. A resolution celebrating the symbol of the United States flag and supporting the goals and ideals of Flag Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 191: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 393: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 413: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 482: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 595: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 775: Mr. BLUNT, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 847: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 881: Mr. AKIN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 932: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 988: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 1021: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 1036: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1074: Mr. CRITZ and Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 1220: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1255: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1340: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1351: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1362: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. NYE.
H.R. 1556: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1584: Mr. WALDEN and Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 1770: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1828: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1844: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 1990: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 2000: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2067: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2189: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 2378: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 2455: Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. DELAUNO.
H.R. 2480: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2515: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2575: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 2579: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2963: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 3012: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 3101: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3168: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3189: Mr. HILL.
H. R. 3359: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HARMAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BACA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 3470: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3480: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 3519: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 3652: Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 3716: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3764: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3765: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3790: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 4038: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4191: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4195: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4278: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 4335: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4347: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. COLE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4505: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 4514: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 4533: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 4662: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4684: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 4800: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4806: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4813: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4832: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4886: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4888: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4914: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4925: Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 4933: Mr. GRAYSON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4943: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 4947: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4993: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 4996: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 4999: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 5012: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5028: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5029: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5090: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5091: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 5092: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 5121: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 5141: Mr. UPTON and Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 5142: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 5156: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 5162: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 5200: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 5211: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5218: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 5226: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 5248: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 5255: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5260: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 5268: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 5300: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 5301: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 5304: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 5307: Mr. NYE and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 5308: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 5312: Mrs. HALVORSON.
 H.R. 5323: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 5340: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 5355: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 5385: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 5412: Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 5426: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 5434: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 5439: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5441: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 5449: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 5476: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 5478: Ms. KILROY.
 H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H. Con. Res. 122: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Con. Res. 200: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Con. Res. 219: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SIREs.

H. Con. Res. 275: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BACA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CASTLE.
 H. Con. Res. 279: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. AKIN.
 H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H. Con. Res. 281: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Con. Res. 283: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. CRITZ.
 H. Res. 22: Mr. FALCOMA-VAEGA.
 H. Res. 173: Mr. DENT and Mr. PERRIELLO.
 H. Res. 333: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Res. 363: Mr. RUSH.
 H. Res. 536: Mr. HIMES.
 H. Res. 546: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HIMES.
 H. Res. 771: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 1226: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. BURGESS.
 H. Res. 1230: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H. Res. 1241: Mr. OLSON and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H. Res. 1322: Mr. PETRI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 1335: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H. Res. 1381: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 1393: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H. Res. 1394: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 1395: Mr. COBLE.
 H. Res. 1396: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 1401: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H. Res. 1406: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. McKEON, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H. Res. 1412: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. KILROY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 1427: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COSTA.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 5486, the Small Business Jobs Tax Relief Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.